DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 208 UD 011 498

TITLE	State Agency Programs for Handicapped, Delinquent and Neglected Children.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Dept. of Education, Columbus.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	64p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.25
DESCRIPTORS	Delinquency, *Disadvantaged Youth, English Programs, *Essays, *Handicapped Children, Learning Motivation, Program Evaluation, *Program Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Ohio State Department Of Education

ABSTRACT

Originally designed to improve the education of disadvantaged children in the public schools, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was amended in 1966 to include children in state institutions who are handicapped, orphaned, neglected, or delinquent. In this collection of brief essays, educators from programs in various parts of the country describe their work and their interests. Included are: (1) a description of the Tennessee Re-Education Program; (2) discussion of innovations in residential care for the handicapped; and, (3) analysis of the idea of the manager as social scientist. (Author/JW)

ED050208

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

State Agency Programs Fo

Handicapped, Delinquent & Neglected Children

Ohio Department of Education
1970

UD 011 498

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

State Agency Programs For

Handicapped, Delinquent & Neglected Children

Ohio Department of Education
1970

ED050208

ED050208

Foreword

Originally designed to improve the education of disadvantaged children in the public schools, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was amended in 1966 to include children in state institutions who are handicapped, orphaned, neglected or delinquent. Project activities are conducted in eligible schools operated by the Ohio Youth Commission, the Ohio Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction, the Ohio Department of Education and Xenia Soldiers and Sailors Orphans Home.

Title I services are designed to supplement state-supported educational programs in the various schools. The major thrust has been in the communication skills area. Other areas of emphasis include supportive activities such as counseling and psychological services.

Instructional materials, equipment, and facilities are basic to the success of educational efforts; however, the moving force has been – and will continue to be – the people involved.

Martin W. Essex
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State of Ohio

MARTIN W. ESSEX

State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Tennessee Re-Education Program

Charles McDonald

The Tennessee Re-Education Program was brought into existence ten years ago because of a national crisis. It was brought into existence because we discovered we were doing very little for children who had emotional behavioral problems, who are labeled variously neurotic, psychotic, emotionally disturbed, behaviorally disordered, delinquent, retarded and other fancy labels. It has been delightful to have been in this country for nine years now and see the proliferation of labels that are used in the United States concerning children and youth.

The federal government granted two million dollars in matching funds to the states of North Carolina and Tennessee for a program designed to develop some constructive alternatives that were workable. One of the conditions placed on the two million dollar grant was that we must construct end programs which could be implemented by non-professional or different professional groups. Even in 1954 there was an acute shortage of professional mental health people. Our job was to develop procedures which could become the forerunner of a national program of public mental health and would be a program of public mental health that did not rely exclusively upon the supply of the mental health professions in psychiatry, psychology, etc. It was absolutely essential that we would come up with a program that could utilize educators, parents, and professionals from across the wide spectrum of human helping services. That is what we have been doing for ten years. We have been trying to come up with some constructive alternatives.

We began with very naive ideas. The idea has developed some sophistication of the times. The technology has developed accordingly. We fully anticipate that five years from now we will find the constructs that we are using and the ideas that we are generating totally inadequate. These ideas have enabled us, at least, to deal with the severely disturbed child.

At this point in time we have a 99% batting average of returning these children to their families and public schooling after an average of six months. After five, six or seven years, these children are still in regular classrooms. We have been doing research with the severely psychotic child and the delinquent child. We are testing the reasonableness of this basic notion: human behavior labeled psychotic, neurotic, delinquent, deviant or stupid is in fact a phenomenon of human learning. It is acquired. We have developed a philosophy that we call the ecological. It is a tragedy that this word has become very popular. We have been using it for almost eight years now and what it means to us is simply this: a human organism cannot exist without supportative or active environment. What's true of the organism is possibly true of all its behavior. To us behavior consists of all the physical activity of the human body, the language, the emotions, and the thoughts of the human being. Every ray of thinking, talking, feeling and acting. Our contention is that they are learned and that they are learned ecologically.

Language is the most obvious activity to start with. I have never yet encountered a baby who was born talking. If I take a Negro child, a Mexican child, an Australian child and give them at birth to a woman in Germany who speaks German they will speak German. They will speak the German dialect that is hers. They will not speak like you and I, they will not speak like their natural parents, because language is totally learned. It is totally ecological. It is determined by the nature of the supporting interactions significant of the people in that environment.

There is no way you can resist or alienate or uproot yourself from your culture or your ecology. It continues to have an effect. One of the big problems is that people have some crazy notion about determinism and turning people into robots. That is the greatest bunch of junk I have ever heard in my life. All I am talking about is influence, not control. I am talking about reciprocal influence. I am not talking about determinism. An ecologist does not say that one person's behavior is determined by

UD011498

At this point in time we have a 99% batting average of returning these children to their families and public schooling after an average of six months. After five, six or seven years, these children are still in regular classrooms. We have been doing research with the severely psychotic child and the delinquent child. We are testing the reasonableness of this basic notion: human behavior labeled psychotic, neurotic, delinquent, deviant or stupid is in fact a phenomenon of human learning. It is acquired. We have developed a philosophy that we call the ecological. It is a tragedy that this word has become very popular. We have been using it for almost eight years now and what it means to us is simply this: a human organism cannot exist without supportative or active environment. What's true of the organism is possibly true of all its behavior. To us behavior consists of all the physical activity of the human body, the language, the emotions, and the thoughts of the human being. Every ray of thinking, talking, feeling and acting. Our contention is that they are learned and that they are learned ecologically.

Language is the most obvious activity to start with. I have never yet encountered a baby who was born talking. If I take a Negro child, a Mexican child, an Australian child and give them at birth to a woman in Germany who speaks German they will speak German. They will speak the German dialect that is hers. They will not speak like you and I, they will not speak like their natural parents, because language is totally learned. It is totally ecological. It is determined by the nature of the supporting interactions significant of the people in that environment.

There is no way you can resist or alienate or uproot yourself from your culture or your ecology. It continues to have an effect. One of the big problems is that people have some crazy notion about determinism and turning people into robots. That is the greatest bunch of junk I have ever heard in my life. All I am talking about is influence, not control. I am talking about reciprocal influence. I am not talking about determinism. An ecologist does not say that one person's behavior is determined by another. What an ecologist says is that human beings have a continuing reciprocal influence on others. The way you think, the way you feel, the way you talk, the way you behave are a phenomena of reciprocal influence. Your thoughts, your feelings, your language, and your behavior did not develop in a vacuum and are not being maintained in a vacuum. They are constantly under the reciprocal influence of other significant people. This is true whether you are eight years of age or 80 years of age. You cannot uproot yourself from your culture.

Some people say they can understand physical activity is behavior and why language is called behavior because they can see it and observe it and measure it. But they ask, "How can you call emotions behavior?" "How can you call thoughts behavior?" Very simply. I don't know what you are thinking or feeling. When you are dealing with another person, you don't have anything going for you or against you except your behavior. They don't have any way of knowing what you are thinking, they don't have any way of knowing what you are feeling. You don't have any way of knowing what they are thinking, you don't have any way of knowing what they are feeling. In the final analysis, the outcome is determined in not how you feel but how you act.

I can come into a room so mad and so angry. If I behave in one way, the person and I are going to go out of that room arm in arm being deeply in love with one another and there is going to be a fantastic bond and my anger and my hostility is going to be one of the most valuable bridges between me and him that ever existed. On the other hand I can come in just as angry and I can behave a different way and the person and I will go out different doors and we will never speak together again. The thing that will make the difference is not that I am angry. The thing that will make the difference will be how I will handle my anger behavior. The human dialogue and the human rapport between people is always a behavioral phenomenon, it is never just a purely emotional phenomenon or an intellectual phenomenon.

It is the behavior, not emotions, that gets

people into trouble. It's not how they feel, it's not how they think. What gets them into trouble with other people is how they behave. No one ever ends up in a mental hospital other than as the result of his behavior, nobody ever ends up in juvenile court other than as a result of his behavior. The way the individual behaves is learned. It is learned as a result of the supporting interaction of other people and it exists and is maintained and supplied only in so far as it continues to be supported. I have never yet seen a piece of human behavior that existed in a vacuum. Anytime you encounter a human being who is behaving, you can, if you will take the time, locate and identify what is it that is keeping that behavior alive. The responses and the interaction of a mother and father are one of the greatest influential factors on how a child learns to think or feel, or hope and act. The neighborhood kids, you know, don't teach the kids the same way of thinking, feeling, talking, and acting as the mother and father.

The Schools and Mental Health

I will give evidence to you now that the conditions which we call mental illness, emotional disturbance and delinquency have a major portion of their cause within the public schools. I want to clearly identify myself as a public school man. I am proud of the public school, I believe in the American public school system. I believe that it is our only salvation, but I also believe we must have a public health program for children who need it. I believe we have the resources and capacity to do it today and I believe we will do it. The only reason I point to the school rather than to the family or other social institutions is that the school has been the only social institution in this point of history that has been so concerned about its own performance that it has permitted itself to be investigated, investigated and investigated. We have more research evidence of what is now functioning in the schools than we do anywhere else in the world.

Everything that I say about the schools applies to the family. It applies everywhere that one human being can transact with another. But please do not identify me as being an anti-school man. I am not. I am totally one-hundred per cent behind the schools. I think they have done a magnificent job. But, neither I nor they will be content until we are doing a job as close to one hundred per cent as we can do it. And, that is what we are talking about. We are talking about what is malfunctioning now that we can correct and need to correct in order to put a stop to drop outs and flunk outs. What is it in the public school system that supports the learning of ways of thinking, talking, feeling and acting that become labeled as incompetence? You know that's an interesting thing. In the last ten years we have become particularly conscious of the fact that when people put labels on other people like stupidity, badness, incompetence, they are only making one of two judgments. They are either making a judgment of competence or of incompetence. Nobody has ever been referred to court, nobody has ever been referred to a mental health clinic, unless somebody else is looking at their behavior and saying that it is inappropriate or incompetent. And these are the only two judgments that people make.

We are increasingly concerned about the fantastically increased incidents of inappropriate and incompetent behavior which are being learned and maintained in the public school. Where is our system malfunctioning? The research clearly indicates at least three causes of events that are operating in the public school that determine whether or not the child acquires behavior that is appropriate and competent or inappropriate and incompetent. There are probably thousands of variables but there are at least three major problems. The first has to do with the simple phenomenon of the teachers' expectations.

We asked some teachers to name the two brightest students in their class and the two dumbest students. Then we observed them in a random fashion for months. We counted how often the teachers pay attention to the child and what the child is doing. What we found was that the teacher pays attention to the bright child approximately ten times more frequently than the dumb one. That seems to be a lousy educa-

t how they feel, it's
ts them into trouble
ey behave. No one
spital other than as
nobody ever ends
an as a result of his
lividual behaves is
sult of the support-
le and it exists and
only in so far as it
I have never yet
vior that existed in
nter a human being
you will take the
is it that is keeping
onses and the inter-
ner are one of the
how a child learns
act. The neighbor-
teach the kids the
talking, and acting

Health

you now that the
ental illness, emo-
uency have a major
the public schools.
myself as a public
he public school, I
olic school system.
alvation, but I also
lic health program
elieve we have the
lo it today and I
nly reason I point
he family or other
chool has been the
oint of history that
its own perform-
tself to be investi-
tigated. We have
at is now function-
o anywhere else in

ut the schools ap-
s everywhere that
act with another.

But please do not identify me as being an anti-school man. I am not. I am totally one-hundred per cent behind the schools. I think they have done a magnificent job. But, neither I nor they will be content until we are doing a job as close to one hundred per cent as we can do it. And, that is what we are talking about. We are talking about what is malfunctioning now that we can correct and need to correct in order to put a stop to drop outs and flunk outs. What is it in the public school system that supports the learning of ways of thinking, talking, feeling and acting that become labeled as incompetence? You know that's an interesting thing. In the last ten years we have become particularly conscious of the fact that when people put labels on other people like stupidity, badness, incompetence, they are only making one of two judgments. They are either making a judgment of competence or of incompetence. Nobody has ever been referred to court, nobody has ever been referred to a mental health clinic, unless somebody else is looking at their behavior and saying that it is inappropriate or incompetent. And these are the only two judgments that people make.

We are increasingly concerned about the fantastically increased incidents of inappropriate and incompetent behavior which are being learned and maintained in the public school. Where is our system malfunctioning? The research clearly indicates at least three causes of events that are operating in the public school that determine whether or not the child acquires behavior that is appropriate and competent or inappropriate and incompetent. There are probably thousands of variables but there are at least three major problems. The first has to do with the simple phenomenon of the teachers' expectations.

We asked some teachers to name the two brightest students in their class and the two dumbest students. Then we observed them in a random fashion for months. We counted how often the teachers pay attention to the child and what the child is doing. What we found was that the teacher pays attention to the bright child approximately ten times more frequently than the dumb one. That seems to be a lousy educational procedure. Wouldn't you think that the teacher would give the greatest attention to the kid that is having the most trouble? They don't. The teacher is human. They like to be around smart people, they like to be around succeeding people more than dummies. Because you see it is a reciprocal thing. We also discovered that the teacher pays attention to the bright kid while the bright kid is on top. When does the teacher pay attention to the dummy? When the dumb kid is not behaving in a proper manner.

The American educator believes that success breeds success. American educators are working with the retarded and they are going to build an educational program. They are likely to build an experience that demands just a little less than they know the kid is capable of. Then, they wonder why at the end of two or three years that is all they get. The mentally retarded are no different from anyone else. It is all a matter of what you expect. You never get any more out of someone than what you expect. If you expect someone to be stupid, idiotic and psychotic, they will be. If a kid is expected to be a hell raiser then he will be.

The second situation operating in a public school is the nature and the structure of the learning experience.

You know one of the things that you can predict and guarantee in the public schools of America? You can guarantee that the longer a kid is in the public school the greater probability that the kid will end up emotionally disturbed or delinquent. Would you like to explain to me why it is that 85% of the kids appearing in juvenile court are two and three years academically retarded. Would you like to explain why that 85 to 90% of the kids that we deal with in the mental health facilities are severely academically retarded? They aren't mentally retarded and they aren't stupid. Over 85% of the children who are initially judged to be mentally retarded are not judged mentally retarded until they have been in public schools for two or three years. The tragedy is that when I get those kids who have been living in the public school system for three or five years, those kids have never once been evaluated. They have been labeled. I hold

my own profession responsible for it. The psychologist affliated with the public schools gives the kid some tests and sends him back to the teacher with a note saying, "This kid doesn't read. Now I've told you what the problem is, it is your problem." It is a rarity in this state when any child who has a problem has anything done about it. The kid will be socially promoted. The kid will be labeled and will be flunked out in one of our biggest flunk out systems – special education.

Twenty years of documented research evidence indicate that the child who is placed in special education learns less in the same period of time than the same type of kid left in the regular classroom. The only justification of special education that we can find in research is that the teachers think they are better adjusted emotionally. I believe special education can be and should be a lot more dramatic. I think special education should be the research division of general education. If the flunk out systems are going to exist, they should be of higher quality. Instead, it works the other way. The more into the flunk-out system you get in this state the lousier education will become.

Another flunk out system along this line is the mental health one, the third major problem. We don't just legally label mental health problems, we signify. We are not content with you being stupid, you are now stupid and crazy. The tragedy of our labeling system is that it is not a "measles" label system. I had the measles three times when I was a kid, but I am not a measle now. Mental health is a "sugar diabetes" labeling system. Once you are crazy, you are always crazy. And if you are paranoid schizophrenic do you ever get over paranoid schizophrenic? No, it is just like diabetes. If somebody has a brief psychotic episode that lasts for five minutes or five hours, or five days, he has the label for the remainder of his life.

When the parents give up and the school gives up and they dump the kids on me I have to sign a contract that I can influence them. And, parents have to sign a contract that the child remains there, or, I don't play ball with them unless they will sign the contract. Because you see the only thing I can do when the kid fouls up so badly that everybody gets rid of him is put him with human beings who will appreciate him.

People do not learn to be crazy or incompetent in a vacuum. Such conditions cannot survive without the continuing support of other people. It is a systems problem and you can never solve a systems problem by victimizing the victim. The only way for us to solve a systems problem is by working with the victim, by changing the victim. The public schools need to change. The parent needs to change. The juvenile court needs to change.

The Re-educational Trip — To Somewhere Or Nowhere

Leonard Green

About 17 years ago, in a large city on the eastern seaboard of the United States, a junior high school student – not very distinguishable from other junior high school students – had been remanded through the courts as a chronic truant for study by a group of child guidance experts, with the commitment of specific recommendations to be made in this case. The team was comprised of a psychiatric social worker, a clinical psychologist and a court psychiatrist.

The social worker reported on the journey the young man had taken prior to this point in his life. His mother had been married three times. The first marriage produced two sons and a great amount of havoc, turmoil and turbulence, ending in divorce. Following the divorce, the mother moved from place to place, working in rather meager positions and placing her two sons in foster homes.

This woman then remarried, and around the seventh month of her pregnancy, her husband died. A son was born from this marriage – the boy under study. It was quite obvious, based on documented observations, that from the very beginning of his life this boy had arrived at an ill-timed, ill-planned junction for his mother. She spent very little time with him, seeking employment, placing him with aunts and foster parents. His two older brothers periodically were placed in homes for fatherless boys. The picture which emerges of the formative years of this young man's life is one of constant upheaval, moving from state to state, place to place, neighborhood to neighborhood, as this mother tried to survive, economically and socially.

Around the sixth year of this boy's life, the mother remarried for the third time. This marriage, like her two former marriages, was marked by much turbulence and acrimony, and many accusations propelled by her onto her third husband. However, it was reported that for the first time in his young life the boy seemed comfortable and wanted to spend, and did spend, much time with his new father. The fact of the matter is that this was the first visible male modeling figure he had ever had. However, much as might be predicted, even though this third husband and our boy's first father sent the two older boys to military school, the accusations continued. He was a "philanderer," he was stingy, he was untrustworthy, etc. The marriage ended in divorce and once more the old pattern was re-established as the mother again sought gainful employment for herself and her brood, moving from place to place and from state to state.

Employers commented that although the woman seemed responsible and her work was characterized by serious industry, she had great difficulty in getting along with others. There was a great amount of self-centered egocentricity and inability to share cooperatively with anyone.

The family eventually moved to a large city on the eastern seaboard. During this period the youngster absented himself from school illegally, and became and was adjudicated a chronic truant. In a preliminary hearing, it was recommended that the boy receive psychological help and that the mother receive the benefit of psychiatric counseling. The boy was returned to school. However, the same pattern reappeared and much as would be expected, neither the boy nor his mother secured the help that had been recommended. Along with his crimes of omission (truancy), several areas of overtly aggressive acts began to appear. His teachers reported that he was uncooperative, he threw things around the classroom and he refused to salute the flag in a period when saluting the flag was still in vogue. For the sake of labeling, using today's terminology, he would have been called a moderately disruptive student.

The psychologist reported, based on tests

nal
here

ge city on the
States, a junior
distinguishable
students – had
ts as a chronic
child guidance
f specific rec-
this case. The
chiatric social
d a court psy-

on the journey
to this point in
married three
d two sons and
and turbulence,
e divorce, the
ace, working in
lacing her two

and around the
y, her husband
marriage – the
vious, based on
from the very
d arrived at an
or his mother.
im, seeking em-
unts and foster
ers periodically
rless boys. The
formative years
of constant up-
state, place to
orhood, as this
mically and so-

is boy's life, the
time. This mar-

riage, like her two former marriages, was marked by much turbulence and acrimony, and many accusations propelled by her onto her third husband. However, it was reported that for the first time in his young life the boy seemed comfortable and wanted to spend, and did spend, much time with his new father. The fact of the matter is that this was the first visible male modeling figure he had ever had. However, much as might be predicted, even though this third husband and our boy's first father sent the two older boys to military school, the accusations continued. He was a "philanderer," he was stingy, he was untrustworthy, etc. The marriage ended in divorce and once more the old pattern was re-established as the mother again sought gainful employment for herself and her brood, moving from place to place and from state to state.

Employers commented that although the woman seemed responsible and her work was characterized by serious industry, she had great difficulty in getting along with others. There was a great amount of self-centered egocentricity and inability to share cooperatively with anyone.

The family eventually moved to a large city on the eastern seaboard. During this period the youngster absented himself from school illegally, and became and was adjudicated a chronic truant. In a preliminary hearing, it was recommended that the boy receive psychological help and that the mother receive the benefit of psychiatric counseling. The boy was returned to school. However, the same pattern reappeared and much as would be expected, neither the boy nor his mother secured the help that had been recommended. Along with his crimes of omission (truancy), several areas of overtly aggressive acts began to appear. His teachers reported that he was uncooperative, he threw things around the classroom and he refused to salute the flag in a period when saluting the flag was still in vogue. For the sake of labeling, using today's terminology, he would have been called a moderately disruptive student.

The psychologist reported, based on tests administered, that this young man had at least above-average intelligence. This was particularly obvious in the verbal aspect of the Wechsler. On the achievement tests he was about one year below grade expectancy. Projective testing indicated that this was an emotionally impoverished young man, a youngster who had been deprived of proper mothering and of any consistent male modeling. He was confused, in terms of identification, in many aspects of his personality.

The psychologist reported that this young man was highly suspicious, distrustful, and filled with many deep feelings of inferiority. The diagnosis at that time was Personality Trait Disturbance (character disorder), Schizoid Features (aloofness, reclusiveness, suspiciousness), with Passive-Aggressive Tendencies. Most of his aggression was handled in a passive, withdrawing way – his truancy, his unwillingness to accept responsibility. Most of his hostilities were handled on a covert rather than an overt level. The psychiatrist reinforced much of what had been said before, indicating that in his judgment this was a rather seriously disturbed youngster who needed professional help and needed it right away. The recommendations tendered to the court by the child guidance team were:

(1) That the boy immediately start in psychological counseling, and

(2) That the mother be ordered to receive help.

The recommendations were tendered to the mother but much as you would expect, rather than accept any onus for her boy's problems she moved. After all, this had been her pattern, her life style – either assault a problem or flee it – never face it through compromise and help.

The family's old pattern was re-established and somewhere around the boy's 16th year, when he was in the 10th grade, this youngster of high-average to superior intellectual ability, functioning only one grade below grade expectancy, dropped out of school. The tragic aspect was that in many ways he had really never dropped in.

Through falsifying credentials and birth

dates, signed by the mother, he enlisted in the armed forces. His military career skirted serious trouble. There were one or two minor court-martials but nothing of any major consequence. His relationships with fellow servicemen were never close. He had no friends, never forming a deep or meaningful relationship with another human person. He was discharged honorably and then, much like the pattern that had been established for him, he started to drift.

He married and had two children. He was never really able to provide for them, even at low-average standards. Crippled by minimum schooling, crippled by deep personality inadequacies, at best he could secure only low-paying, non-stimulating work. His marriage, much like his mother's, was marked by turmoil and mistrust. At times, at social gatherings, his wife would belittle him, even in talking about the most intimate aspects of the husband-wife relationship.

This young man, this story, this life tragedy, is much like those of many young people who eventually come to our institutions for help. This story can be duplicated a millionfold – young people, diagnosed and then untreated, convinced that they were never wanted in the first place, with years of failure and a deep, foreboding feeling of bitterness and distaste for their own unique lives. This young man, however, was unique – and he is known to all of you. On November 22, 1963, Lee Harvey Oswald assassinated John Fitzgerald Kennedy!

I would hazard a reasonable guess that none of us, with all our sophisticated knowledge, our empathic feeling for others in trouble, our drive to heal, to correct, to aid, to rescue – none of us can muster a feeling of compassion for this boy grown into manhood. Perhaps it is because the life he snuffed out was marked by its extreme contrast to his own – in its rootedness, the love, the guidance, the care, the whole life force of John Fitzgerald Kennedy moving out and touching, and being touched in return. Perhaps it is because of our own guilt and through our employment, defensively, of denial, that we cannot accept why Lee Harvey Oswald committed such a heinous crime. In many ways the crime, or the arena for the crime, is our society, and there were two victims – John F. Kennedy and Lee Harvey Oswald – the haves and the have-nots.

The serious questions facing us in our corrective and rehabilitative work are: Could we have helped Lee Harvey Oswald if he came to our institution? Could we have humanized an otherwise dehumanized existence through the collection of many Lee Harvey Oswalds housed together on the command of rehabilitation? What are the steps that a young person like this seems to take in our institutions? How about us – the staff? What must we do? Are there special approaches to making special education really special for people who have premised their successes by their failures in life? Let's spend a few minutes on these questions and permit me the license to review what I have experienced and, hopefully, observed accurately, during my many years in the field.

A youngster enters our therapeutic school. Who among you would enjoy being labeled special, particularly from a special negative basis? He is here not because he wants to be here, but because he has been told to be here. He has been carefully told and retold that he is getting a rare opportunity in life – another chance. But it has been my experience that he often sees it in a far different way – he sees it as another chance at failure, another chance at getting another set of adults to quit, another chance to prove what he has to prove, in the only way he knows to prove it – that he can excel by not meeting the expectations of authority. However, he has been tested, he has been labeled, a set of recommendations have been tendered, and he is here. He is now a fully matriculated student, patient, or inmate in your institution.

Over the years I think I have been able to discern certain necessary steps that a young person seems compelled to take during his long walk or short journey in our rehabilitory palaces, our therapeutic schools, our hygienic, help-producing environments. Certainly there are al-

nlisted in the
r skirted seri-
o minor court-
r consequence.
vicemen were
never forming
with another
ged honorably
that had been
drift.

idren. He was
them, even at
by minimum
sonality inad-
only low-pay-
arriage, much
y turmoil and
rings, his wife
ing about the
sband-wife re-

s life tragedy,
g people who
ions for help.
millionfold –
en untreated,
wanted in the
and a deep,
nd distaste for
ng man, how-
own to all of
Harvey Oswald
nedy!

uess that none
nowledge, our
ible, our drive
e – none of us
n for this boy
is because the
y its extreme
ness, the love,
life force of
ut and touch-
Perhaps it is
ough our em-
hat we cannot
mmitted such

a heinous crime. In many ways the crime, or the arena for the crime, is our society, and there were two victims – John F. Kennedy and Lee Harvey Oswald – the haves and the have-nots.

The serious questions facing us in our corrective and rehabilitative work are: Could we have helped Lee Harvey Oswald if he came to our institution? Could we have humanized an otherwise dehumanized existence through the collection of many Lee Harvey Oswalds housed together on the command of rehabilitation? What are the steps that a young person like this seems to take in our institutions? How about us – the staff? What must we do? Are there special approaches to making special education really special for people who have premised their successes by their failures in life? Let's spend a few minutes on these questions and permit me the license to review what I have experienced and, hopefully, observed accurately, during my many years in the field.

A youngster enters our therapeutic school. Who among you would enjoy being labeled special, particularly from a special negative basis? He is here not because he wants to be here, but because he has been told to be here. He has been carefully told and retold that he is getting a rare opportunity in life – another chance. But it has been my experience that he often sees it in a far different way – he sees it as another chance at failure, another chance at getting another set of adults to quit, another chance to prove what he has to prove, in the only way he knows to prove it – that he can excel by not meeting the expectations of authority. However, he has been tested, he has been labeled, a set of recommendations have been tendered, and he is here. He is now a fully matriculated student, patient, or inmate in your institution.

Over the years I think I have been able to discern certain necessary steps that a young person seems compelled to take during his long walk or short journey in our rehabilitory palaces, our therapeutic schools, our hygienic, help-producing environments. Certainly there are always variations and I am running the risk of being a generalist in a highly specialized field, but these are my empirical observations. I think I have been able to discern the many young people who have come to our place mapping for themselves, without compass, almost instinctually, automatically and unconsciously, four steps – steps that certainly overlap and are non-exclusive, but that are nevertheless four definable, and discernible stages of life in the institution.

Four Steps of Life in the Institution

Although the student is frightened, and regardless of his braggadocio, his brazenness, his surface sullenness, the first step in the entry is what I call, for want of better terminology, the *Honeymoon* – or the period of initiation. It is almost as if the young person says to himself, "I am here now. There is not much I can do about being here. I will play along with this set of professionals with their fancy titles and bizarre names and odd ways of doing things. I'd better get the lay of the land. I'd better find out who really runs this place." He knows full well that it is the students, the inmates or the patients, not us, the legally appointed administrators.

At times during the honeymoon or initiation period, we find ourselves professionally pinching each other. Even with our profound knowledge, fused with years and years of correcting errors only to make more, we feel compelled to ask, "Is this the right student? Perhaps they sent the wrong child? Where are the cantankerousness, the profanity, the dishonesty, the unmannerly behavior?" Quite frequently we see just the opposite – the chronic truant attending all his classes, the student with a long dossier of surliness and abrasive behavior towards adults, exercising the very best manners and politeness, filled with words like "Thank you, yes sir, excuse me ma'am." As we pinch each other we silently, but hopefully, wish for the impossible – that somehow the set of professionals who recommended our institution were wrong, and we

have a special student who is specially good rather than specially bad.

However, like all honeymoons, depending on their emotional and financial funding, if there is to be a real marriage of two human persons the moon and the honey are replaced by the first confrontation – that awful morning when the honeymooners realize they are now married. Sometimes the honeymoon lasts but a few days and we have observed honeymoons which, if permitted, would go on for months. But just as in marriage, no real relationship can grow premised on the never-never land of "They were married and lived happily ever after."

Suddenly and sometimes without previous warning, perhaps because we just do not know how to read behavioral signals, we have reached the second step – the "It's all bad" or period of *Rejection.* At roll call the youngster is missing. A fellow staff member has been assaulted. The youngster has been caught lying, stealing, pill-popping, or selling drugs. You can probably read the period of rejection even more clearly in us, the staff. We become openly angry and we verbally denounce the youngster for manifesting the very behavior that brought him to our institution in the first place. How dare he act the way we knew he was supposed to act? How dare he put us to the test?

This is the period of cruciality for the institution. This is where the validity of the institution and its workers is tested. This is where the courage level, the stomach, is brought into focus. It is one thing to say we service disruptive and emotionally disturbed young people; it is a far different thing to perform that service. It is here, during this period of rejection, that we get in touch with the young person's true value structure and he, hopefully, if we do what we say we do, can start to get in touch with ours.

This is a period that is marked by bombast. It is a period where the real institution has to stand forth against the assault of the real youngster. Letters are sent home, if there is a home. "The staff are barbarians. We are beaten every day. They are poisoning us with their food. They have crippled us sexually by chemically flavoring the food with saltpeter. All the other kids here are criminals. They will make me worse. They are perverts. They are all homosexuals. Our place has an epidemic of venereal disease. The staff is ill trained and uncaring. If you don't get me out of here, I will go crazy. If you don't get me out of here, I think I will kill myself." And lastly, and one that I am particularly fond of because it works so well – "If you don't get me out of here, *just you wait!*"

During this period, you and I on the line, working with the young person, have very little waiting to do. In fact, we might find ourselves doing a lot of running – running after the youngster when he runs away; running after the youngster as he runs away from us when we try to make contact with him; running towards the youngster in a confrontation where he is going to make sure he will continue to be a successful failure, and we are going to make sure we will bankrupt his well-laid plans. During this period, even before we get the opportunity to reject the youngster for his maladaptive, obnoxious behavior, he has rejected us.

Other complicating factors arise, such as reinforcement by his peers who, whether we like it or not, seem more important to him than we do. One word of caution here: It would be wise for all institutions to stagger enrollments to avoid having a large group of youngsters all in the period of rejection together. Several years ago, at our place, we had several near riots, mass elopements, sit-ins, etc. Through a process of scientific data collection followed by a careful checking out of our information, we discovered our error – we had accepted a large group of youngsters at the same time.

This period of rejection can last from one month up to two or three years. So much depends on our skill, the student's life style and unique personality, and those other students who surround him and emotionally and intellectually nourish him. Keep in mind that quite frequently the real laws that govern the institution are those of the young people. It is of more value to the student to act out, to act against, to stand up and be assaultive to authority, than it is to conform

flavoring the food with saltpeter. All the other kids here are criminals. They will make me worse. They are perverts. They are all homosexuals. Our place has an epidemic of venereal disease. The staff is ill trained and uncaring. If you don't get me out of here, I will go crazy. If you don't get me out of here, I think I will kill myself." And lastly, and one that I am particularly fond of because it works so well – "If you don't get me out of here, *just you wait!*"

During this period, you and I on the line, working with the young person, have very little waiting to do. In fact, we might find ourselves doing a lot of running – running after the youngster when he runs away; running after the youngster as he runs away from us when we try to make contact with him; running towards the youngster in a confrontation where he is going to make sure he will continue to be a successful failure, and we are going to make sure we will bankrupt his well-laid plans. During this period, even before we get the opportunity to reject the youngster for his maladaptive, obnoxious behavior, he has rejected us.

Other complicating factors arise, such as reinforcement by his peers who, whether we like it or not, seem more important to him than we do. One word of caution here: It would be wise for all institutions to stagger enrollments to avoid having a large group of youngsters all in the period of rejection together. Several years ago, at our place, we had several near riots, mass elopements, sit-ins, etc. Through a process of scientific data collection followed by a careful checking out of our information, we discovered our error – we had accepted a large group of youngsters at the same time.

This period of rejection can last from one month up to two or three years. So much depends on our skill, the student's life style and unique personality, and those other students who surround him and emotionally and intellectually nourish him. Keep in mind that quite frequently the real laws that govern the institution are those of the young people. It is of more value to the student to act out, to act against, to stand up and be assaultive to authority, than it is to conform and accept what authority wants. To clarify what I mean, I have found that during this period of rejection, a youngster will read me off and then immediately, to get his real pay-off, he must share this with valued peers. On his priority of values the real value is not to tell an adult off, but to tell his peers that he told an adult off.

When it is bad, it is usually all bad. There are many runaways. There is much destruction of property. You will often find the delinquent giving the right reasons for the wrong principles just as we, the staff, quite frequently give the wrong reasons for sound principles. It is during this period that a therapeutic school frequently gives up – sometimes not because it wants to but because it has to, and sometimes because it is following, without analyzing it, a pattern deeply rooted in tradition that says the group is always more important than the individual.

It has been my experience that when you remove one malcontent, one purveyor of badness, one usurper, one poisoner of the climate, most assuredly there is another waiting to ascend the pecking order. I realize here that I am begging the question of what to do, but I am making an observation that I have lived through, despite the fact that there are certainly times when an institution would be committing agency psychosis by keeping a youngster for whom it does not have the resources, the manpower, or the know-how with which to work.

If the institution personnel continue to try to make contact and do not pay back the youngster's rancor and hostility with too great ferocity and counter-umbrage, in spite of the youngster, in spite of his many failures in interpersonal relationships, quietly, positive relationships with adults start to develop, and they start to develop with adults who are usually non-professional and non-threatening. This is particularly true for the so-called delinquent who, as a physical and motoric being, starts looking towards a contact with an athletic coach, a shop teacher, a house attendant, or a janitor. "It is safer. I think I will be known here. I think I can be comfortable here and perhaps even secure here," the youngster unconsciously seems to say to himself.

If, somehow, the institution has the courage to actually live by its own postulated rules, a third period or a *third step* along the journey starts to develop – the *Maybe* or *Perhaps* stage. This is characterized by the development of ambivalent dependency relationships. Here the youngster, much as little children will do, divides his world in half – the Goodies and the Baddies among the staff. He seems to operate during this period in a totally black and white world. Certain staff are either totally good or totally bad; there are no shadings, no tintings, no grays. He reaches out and tends to cling, particularly when he is in trouble, to perhaps one or several adults in the environment.

This is the period when real work can be accomplished. By real work this writer means re-education. This is the time when psychotherapy or psychological counseling has the best opportunity to be employed. This is the time when a young person, skillfully and professionally guided, can be put in touch with his real self and not his behaving self. This is when the therapies – individual or group –can help the young person start to unlock that part of his personality apparatus that is arrested, fixated or locked in at an earlier level of development.

Let's stop for a moment to look at a very cardinal issue – one that too frequently is overlooked and blindly passed over in the advertising literature portraying our institutions. A therapeutic milieu does not become re-educative by dictate, or by the mandate of the published word. Bringing together a collection of disturbed or delinquent youth under one roof or umbrella can in itself guarantee only one thing – that we have a collection of disturbed or delinquent youth.

To miss this point is to miss what is probably the most powerful negative factor interfering with rehabilitative work. Fortunately there seems to be an answer, and this is to realize that to the traditional treatment model of psychiatry, clinical psychology and social work which for years has been squared with special education, a fifth and most important treatment instrument must be added, the student! And this must be done not as an addendum, but as an integral part of the continuum.

Regardless of how hard we try with
apies, even employing the most soph
treatment models, there is a constant u
rent that pulls the youngsters towards ea
and towards a reinforcement of symptor
– perhaps even the picking up of new sy
atology. It has been my observation tha
we involve our students and make ther
of the running of the institution, the
making and the sharing of informatio
their situation, we run into a very large st
block and the situation stays the same
tive, hostile, and to be opposed and a
But if the student is living in an envi
that is conducive to growth, that push
pendence rather than dependence, that
him in the decision-making about his l
forces him to help in disciplining him
chances for remission of both symptor
and deeper core problems are far brigh
they would be if we employed the str
do what I tell you and only what I t
approach.

I therefore recommend to you to
involve in the daily commerce of life s
uations in a trusting way, young perso
have learned mistrust and who are ofte
untrustworthy. But how else are they
the pains and the pleasures of being tru
being involved, of being counted for, co
and counted on?

It means that many errors will hav
tolerated. It means that many fine plans
by the wayside. But it also means a ch
the young persons in your institution t
sponsibly rather than to be forced to
sponsibly by our thrust to make them de
and therefore infantile. It means that
have to trust each other and have to w
flattened, non-hierarchical management

One word of caution – your institut
haps will not be as clean. Some will th
will state, that it is too loose, that it does
enough rules, that structure has been den
You will be asked the question, "Who is
this institution, the kids or you?" The fac
matter is – if the institution is to run a
it is to meet its stated objectives and ju

Regardless of how hard we try with our therapies, even employing the most sophisticated treatment models, there is a constant undercurrent that pulls the youngsters towards each other and towards a reinforcement of symptomatology – perhaps even the picking up of new symptomatology. It has been my observation that unless we involve our students and make them a part of the running of the institution, the decision-making and the sharing of information about their situation, we run into a very large stumbling block and the situation stays the same – negative, hostile, and to be opposed and assaulted. But if the student is living in an environment that is conducive to growth, that pushes independence rather than dependence, that involves him in the decision-making about his life, that forces him to help in disciplining himself, the chances for remission of both symptomatology and deeper core problems are far brighter than they would be if we employed the strict "You do what I tell you and only what I tell you" approach.

I therefore recommend to you to trust, to involve in the daily commerce of life space situations in a trusting way, young persons who have learned mistrust and who are often quite untrustworthy. But how else are they to learn the pains and the pleasures of being trusted, of being involved, of being counted for, counted in and counted on?

It means that many errors will have to be tolerated. It means that many fine plans will fall by the wayside. But it also means a chance for the young persons in your institution to act responsibly rather than to be forced to act irresponsibly by our thrust to make them dependent, and therefore infantile. It means that the staff have to trust each other and have to work in a flattened, non-hierarchical management model.

One word of caution – your institution perhaps will not be as clean. Some will think, and will state, that it is too loose, that it doesn't have enough rules, that structure has been demolished. You will be asked the question, "Who is running this institution, the kids or you?" The fact of the matter is – if the institution is to run at all, if it is to meet its stated objectives and justify its whole reason for being – no "one" runs it – it governs together. And it does this not on the three traditional R's of reading, writing, and arithmetic, but on the three special R's of Realness, Responsibility and Relationship.

What do we mean when we say an institution is real? We mean it meets real issues. It deals with the now, and perhaps tomorrow, although it doesn't forget the past, and certainly it doesn't put its head in the sand like an ostrich. It doesn't verbalize one lesson and teach another by its behavior. We all know perhaps too well that how we behave towards each other on the adult level in our institutions very, very frequently is duplicated by how our students behave towards us. The whole essence of realness is to teach our young people in a way that makes it possible for them to teach themselves. Unless this is accomplished, no real education ever really occurs.

What do we mean when we say the institution is responsible? We mean that when there is heat, and there is action, and there are issues and confrontations of ideas handled together, its staff and its students stay together. You can chart this by the few runaways or elopements that occur.

Lastly, the institution operates on powerful, positive, meaningful relationships, either in therapy, or in the environment, or with a teacher or some other meaningful, responsible adult – a person on whom our student can model a new life style of growth and change.

When these three R's are there as an input, something begins to happen. Slowly, cautiously, sometimes hardly discernible to the eye, an output starts to develop. The youngster begins to need fewer instructions, less support. He is learning to walk, and at times he is even capable of running short distances, figuratively speaking. He now has reached the *fourth* stage in your institution – he is ready to *Leave.*

The business of leaving is quite difficult for many young people. The student has a haven at the institution. He has been understood here; he has been known here; and, to have reached this fourth plateau, he knows he has been loved here. And yet he must leave and re-enter the

outer society which is less protected, less cushioned. The outside, perhaps more brutal world, beckons and waits. It is here that half-way houses, quarter-way houses, three-quarter-way houses – or any fraction or combination you wish, must be employed. There is no magical formula – only a unique equation – a unique set of blended and fused conditions to help him feel more comfortable, less apprehensive, and within which he can learn to handle independence through his own self-regulatory devices.

During this period you should expect anxiety, and fear, and a retreat in the form of regression – a rush back to what the student feels was a safe level of personality development. It is important, outstandingly so, not to lose touch with the student at this point, to understand that it is relatively normal behavior for all of us to retreat to an earlier level where we feel safe, in order to solidify our growth, and then to shoot forward again. Many young people, depending on their problems, will continue to need outpatient supportive help. Here, again, the re-entry program and the entry back into the community must be made special for the special student.

I have a feeling, based on years of working with many troubled and oft-times delinquent young people, and of touching and being touched by them in return, that unless a journey such as I have charted occurs in our institutions, nothing occurs at all.

All of us in institutional rehabilitatory work must be aware of the phenomenon presented by our own psychological need to create dependency relationships, unconsciously of course, with the young persons who are assigned to us with the over-all goal of being prepared to leave us to live relatively independent, constructive lives. I have observed this phenomenon too frequently to find it a casual occurrence. In this last stage it is almost as if a silent, but almost automatic, cheer goes up when a youngster displays some regressive behavior so that we can keep him and continue to be psychologically nourished by his dependency on us. There are hundreds of examples of this phenomenon. One that comes to mind is, "The world is too hostile out there. He is going to mess up." Seldom is this followed by the factual question, "Who doesn't?" This phenomenon can have a distinctive braking, or barrier effect on the whole re-entry phase unless we, as workers in the field, are in touch with our own psychological needs and make doubly sure that our personal agenda priorities are not superimposed on the young people. Re-entry is difficult at best. It is threatening not only to the student, the patient, or the inmate but also to us on the staff level.

The Staff

Regardless of our own personal needs, we, the staff, are to a large measure the true therapeutic ingredients in the so-called therapeutic environment. We have to organize and operate from a base of certain behavioral qualities which are almost instinctual rather than intellectually thought out and planned. There is a modus operandi, a certain network of characteristics that seem to pattern themselves in those successful practitioners who are able to somehow work constructively with young people – and particularly with the young people housed in our institutions. At this point I want to emphasize that I list here what I consider to be a style, a series of approaches that seem to characterize the successful practitioner. This not necessarily mean there are not others, but these I consider to be the minimum requirements:

(1.) The successful therapeutic educator demonstrates *patience,* not resignation to continued failures, but a readiness to wait for successes. He understands it is going to take at least as many months for behavior to change as it took years to develop in the first place.

(2.) Secondly, our successful teacher possesses *humor.* He has learned to take his work very seriously, but not himself. He operates with an automatic thermostatic control, laughing at the madness around him, but laughing with the student, not at him. Humor, of course, is based on tragedy, and he uses humor as a way of making tragic events more bearable and liveable. Without this ingredient, his life and his work would

He is going to mess up." Seldom is this followed by the factual question, "Who doesn't?" This phenomenon can have a distinctive braking, or barrier effect on the whole re-entry phase unless we, as workers in the field, are in touch with our own psychological needs and make doubly sure that our personal agenda priorities are not superimposed on the young people. Re-entry is difficult at best. It is threatening not only to the student, the patient, or the inmate but also to us on the staff level.

The Staff

Regardless of our own personal needs, we, the staff, are to a large measure the true therapeutic ingredients in the so-called therapeutic environment. We have to organize and operate from a base of certain behavioral qualities which are almost instinctual rather than intellectually thought out and planned. There is a modus operandi, a certain network of characteristics that seem to pattern themselves in those successful practitioners who are able to somehow work constructively with young people – and particularly with the young people housed in our institutions. At this point I want to emphasize that I list here what I consider to be a style, a series of approaches that seem to characterize the successful practitioner. This not necessarily mean there are not others, but these I consider to be the minimum requirements:

(1.) The successful therapeutic educator demonstrates *patience*, not resignation to continued failures, but a readiness to wait for successes. He understands it is going to take at least as many months for behavior to change as it took years to develop in the first place.

(2.) Secondly, our successful teacher possesses *humor*. He has learned to take his work very seriously, but not himself. He operates with an automatic thermostatic control, laughing at the madness around him, but laughing with the student, not at him. Humor, of course, is based on tragedy, and he uses humor as a way of making tragic events more bearable and liveable. Without this ingredient, his life and his work would be unbearable, and in many ways he would become unbearable and a burden to his students.

(3.) The successful staff member has the ability to *motivate* – to light a spark which will serve as an ignition mechanism. He does this by participating and by being involved in activities with kids. His verbal output is held to a minimum, and he teaches and motivates through activity. He finds that his vocabulary is filled with many more "cans" than "can'ts" and "mays" rather than "may nots." This is almost automatic with him. He somehow has been able to emphatically understand the unsureness, the insecurity and the crippling feelings of inadequacy coming from his students. He starts the student with safe, almost sure activities – sure in the sense of guaranteeing concrete success with a minimal amount of effort. The sparks that set the ignition apparatus going in a direction that develops into self-motivation are small, short-termed, planned, success-rendering experiences with immediate pay-off, the reinforcement being another success experience. In other words, he reverses the failure-success syndrome to a success syndrome. This is difficult because he is fighting, figuratively speaking, the currents and tides of time that brought the youngster into the institution in the first place.

(4.) Our successful practitioner does not play cops and robbers with the students nor, for that matter, does he play cowboys and Indians. Rather, in an effort to humanize the dehumanizing experience of being sent away, he develops around the student an atmosphere and environment anchored in a *shared responsibility* model of management. He consults, he seeks advice from the student, he accepts criticism, and although he evaluates and grades the students, he also has a reciprocal grading plan developed for himself. His own evaluative sheet is not posted with A's and B's, yet the grading is most important. The F's consist of "You let me down. You let us down. You are a phony. You don't trust us. You brought your hang-ups from home into the institution today. Why are you on my back?" This is the kind of grading I am talking about.

The successful practitioner governs the situation, whether it be in the classroom, on the job, in a hallway or a dormitory, not from a drive to be on top of things, but from the more positive drive to be *in touch* with things. This writer's experience has been that when the desire to be on top of things is the consummate goal, one finds quite frequently that he is on top of nothing.

(5.) Another most positive quality I have observed in the successful practitioner is the ability to develop a framework, to create an atmosphere, which *supports growth* rather than suppressing it. Certainly there is "law and order," there are rules and regulations which are understandable and are understood by the student – but there is also *reason*. While it would be complete naiveté to feel that an understanding of the reasons for rules and regulations would automatically give them support, we must ask the question, "Without a reason, why a rule? Why even take the time to question whether or not one should obey the rule?"

(6.) We have been told and carefully retold that curiosity killed the cat. However, our successful worker understands that *curiosity* is a powerful human drive; that if it is used constructively and skillfully by teachers, it fuels creativity, which is a direct line to a feeling of personal worth and a really special place in the sun. It gives a sense of uniqueness –the uniqueness of you as a person, rather than you as just another number in a long series of numbers.

(7.) Our successful teacher or practitioner has an acute sense of *timing*. To use computerized terms, he is plugged in. He doesn't try to teach Shakespeare, Wordsworth, or even O'Henry after his students have been involved in a good ballgame, or a flurry of fisticuffs. Instead, he provides a cooling-off period before attempting to tune the student in on abstract subject matter. This necessarily means that although he lives and works in an environment which has a frame of reference, within the stated territory there is freedom, there is elasticity, there is the teacher's right to intuitively adapt to the situation and to the need of his students.

(8.) Our teacher has the ability to *take e*
tional temperatures. Certainly he doesn't carr
thermometer in his pocket, but he carries an
tuitive thermometer in his hand and in his st
ach – one that can take emotional temperat
both for the kids and for himself. He knows
to measure the emotional loading before pla
burdensome problems on already overloa
shoulders, or loading his students with his
emotional problems. He stays in touch with w
has happened in the hours preceding his cont
with the students. He realizes if he has ha
fight with his wife, or if his car broke down
if he was caught in a speed trap, or if he
alienated or hurt, that it would be wise for
to take some emotional distance and get in to
with himself before he tries to touch his stude
He knows how easy it is, almost inviting, to
place or project his anger onto his captive gro
After all, the model is there in the person of
student, and unfortunately, it is one of th
unwritten laws in all institutions – when
doubt, or when you need a scapegoat for y
own shortcomings, scream at the kids.

(9.) The successful teacher I have obse
knows how to *communicate*. He deals in speci
He stays away from ambiguities and from swe
ing generalizations and stereotypes. (Please
don this observation but I do believe it is
mane – I wish that some of us on the adminis
tive level would do the same.) Our qua
teacher has very few "maybes" or "perhaps
"I will look into its" which he never bother
do. Rather, there are "yesses" and "nos" and s
"I don't know but I will find outs" – which
always does. He is predictable, he is known,
cause he behaves in a predictable and kn
way. He employs an economy of meanin
words and he doesn't, as Fritz Redl has poin
out, give wrong reasons for sound princi
Along with this, he stays away from moraliz
from sermonizing, from patronizing, from s
pathizing, and from personalizing.

(10.) Lastly, the student finds him a most
teresting, viable human being, and I have
idea that this is because he is interested in m

(8.) Our teacher has the ability to *take emotional temperatures.* Certainly he doesn't carry a thermometer in his pocket, but he carries an intuitive thermometer in his hand and in his stomach – one that can take emotional temperatures both for the kids and for himself. He knows how to measure the emotional loading before placing burdensome problems on already overloaded shoulders, or loading his students with his own emotional problems. He stays in touch with what has happened in the hours preceding his contact with the students. He realizes if he has had a fight with his wife, or if his car broke down, or if he was caught in a speed trap, or if he feels alienated or hurt, that it would be wise for him to take some emotional distance and get in touch with himself before he tries to touch his students. He knows how easy it is, almost inviting, to displace or project his anger onto his captive group. After all, the model is there in the person of the student, and unfortunately, it is one of those unwritten laws in all institutions – when in doubt, or when you need a scapegoat for your own shortcomings, scream at the kids.

(9.) The successful teacher I have observed knows how to *communicate.* He deals in specifics. He stays away from ambiguities and from sweeping generalizations and stereotypes. (Please pardon this observation but I do believe it is germane – I wish that some of us on the administrative level would do the same.) Our quality teacher has very few "maybes" or "perhaps" or "I will look into its" which he never bothers to do. Rather, there are "yesses" and "nos" and some "I don't know but I will find outs" – which he always does. He is predictable, he is known, because he behaves in a predictable and known way. He employs an economy of meaningful words and he doesn't, as Fritz Redl has pointed out, give wrong reasons for sound principles. Along with this, he stays away from moralizing, from sermonizing, from patronizing, from sympathizing, and from personalizing.

(10.) Lastly, the student finds him a most interesting, viable human being, and I have an idea that this is because he is interested in many things in the world rather than being restricted to traveling through life down a narrow corridor of singular activity and interest. He can also perform somewhat adequately in areas that interest the students–in athletics, in the manual arts, and for that rare student, in the intellectual sphere.

Although this is a load of ability and describes a rather uniquely mature person, I have had the pleasure over many years to observe more people in the field who have many of these qualities than we have had a right to expect.

I would rather not sum up at this point, as the story is still open. There is a long road ahead and there are many errors that need correcting for us in the field, who attempt to ameliorate or at least reduce problems for problem children. We have done much that is right and some that is wrong, and we have come to the point where at least we understand that the young person entering our institution must travel a long, arduous and torturous journey. We feel we can now chart the overlapping stages or steps in this journey. We know because we have observed them in operation, that there are environments which are conducive to growth and problem resolution, environments that focus around the special set of 3 R's of realness, responsibility, and the fostering of positive relationships. And lastly, we have observed a network of qualities or characteristics embodied in successful practioners in our field.

Our task is to put the pieces together and get them working in an integrated, fused way for the student. This seems to me to be the major objective for us in administrative roles. We are the guiders who must help our institutional ship handle both turbulent and placid seas. Whether or not we are successful, if we are honest we will know, our staff will know, and most important, our students will know.

In the final analysis, although it is extremely important what and how we teach, more important is what the student learns; and although it is important how the story begins, it is far more important how it ends.

Program Planning and Evaluation

Joseph L. Mazur

Introduction

The presentation this afternoon will not be theoretically oriented. Though many of the ideas have been drawn from theoretical foundations of operations research, cost benefit, and the general area of systems, the basic point of view will be operationally oriented. If the concepts and experiences during the next hour have been organized and developed properly you should have at least first stage knowledge related to developing answers to two questions:

(1.) How can a public agency initiate and operationalize Planning-Evaluation-Development procedures as a normal way of conducting its business?

(2.) How can Planning—Evaluation and Development strengthen agency effectiveness?

During the process of developing answers to the preceding questions, efforts will be made to take some of the mystique out of Planning—Evaluation—Development. If all goes well you should walk out of this conference chanting Program Planning—Evaluation and Development all the way home.

Systematic Planning — A Way To Increase Program Effectiveness

Within the past five years, public agencies have had increasing opportunities to initiate and develop programs for the purpose of solving persistent problems.

The increased availability of state and federal funds has provided resources to employ personnel, purchase equipment and upgrade in-service training. In many instances current practices have been intensified. In other instances new attacks have been made on old problems.

Whether you represent agencies working with mentally retarded, aged citizens, juvenile delinquents, impoverished, handicapped or public school youth, these have been and promise to be years for exploring ways and means to improve services, introduce new approaches and strengthen capabilities of agencies to accomplish the missions they were originally created to attain.

Program Planning is not a road to magic answers or instant solutions. It provides a systematic means for *spending* staff time and talent on the development of goal oriented programs. Once it becomes a part of the standard operating procedures of an organization, it involves the following activities.

(1) Needs Assessment
(2) Goal and Objective Setting
(3) Program Creating Proposal
(4) Program Implementation
(5) Evaluation (Process)
(6) Feedback
(7) Development
(8) Evaluation (Product)

The main features of these elements of Planning — Evaluation and Development will be highlighted in the section that follows:

Needs Assessment — An Intelligent Starting Point

Each of your agencies has needs that can be identified within minutes. However, quick identification of needs does not necessarily surface those needs that are most critical or most amenable to change. Needs assessment does not have to be a complicated expensive enterprise. Essentially it involves a review of records, case studies and test performance data so that a list of the major needs can be made. Once this is done, it becomes possible to assign priorities to the list of needs.

A major production is not necessary. Armies of specialized personnel are not necessary. However, provisions must be made within each agency to develop staff who have the skills and

Whether you represent agencies working with mentally retarded, aged citizens, juvenile delinquents, impoverished, handicapped or public school youth, these have been and promise to be years for exploring ways and means to improve services, introduce new approaches and strengthen capabilities of agencies to accomplish the missions they were originally created to attain.

Program Planning is not a road to magic answers or instant solutions. It provides a systematic means for *spending* staff time and talent on the development of goal oriented programs. Once it becomes a part of the standard operating procedures of an organization, it involves the following activities.

(1) Needs Assessment
(2) Goal and Objective Setting
(3) Program Creating Proposal
(4) Program Implementation
(5) Evaluation (Process)
(6) Feedback
(7) Development
(8) Evaluation (Product)

The main features of these elements of Planning – Evaluation and Development will be highlighted in the section that follows:

Needs Assessment – An Intelligent Starting Point

Each of your agencies has needs that can be identified within minutes. However, quick identification of needs does not necessarily surface those needs that are most critical or most amenable to change. Needs assessment does not have to be a complicated expensive enterprise. Essentially it involves a review of records, case studies and test performance data so that a list of the major needs can be made. Once this is done, it becomes possible to assign priorities to the list of needs.

A major production is not necessary. Armies of specialized personnel are not necessary. However, provisions must be made within each agency to develop staff who have the skills and capabilities that enable collection, analysis and reporting of data that can form the basis for needs assessment. In those instances where staff capability is not available, part time staff, university personnel and private organizations can assist agency administrators in accomplishing a needs assessment at low cost.

The immediate pay-off to agency administrators comes in the form of a visible listing of problems and needs toward which agency efforts should be directed.

If an assessment of needs becomes part of the way agencies engage in planning, key staff members will be given opportunities to gain new and clearer insights into problems. In turn better decisions will be made with regard to setting priorities, allocating resources, and organizing support for special programs. The needs assessment provides a rationale for embarking on selected programs.

Goals and Objectives Precede Program Development

It probably borders on the obvious to observe that many agencies do not systematically develop objectives before developing programs. Daily responsibilities, limited staffs and response to crises make systematic planning procedures a luxury that is rarely attainable in typical public agencies. In many instances keeping the doors open is a major achievement.

The intelligent use of objectives as a vital ingredient of planning, implementing and evaluating programs should lead to greater accomplishment of intended outcomes. Essentially an objective describes an intended outcome. It describes what you want to accomplish. When stated well, it:

- defines the target,
- sets up the criteria by which quality of performance can be judged,
- provides a guide for selecting instructional resources
- describes the product that is anticipated,
- provides the conditions by which success or failure can be determined,

- provides a basis for developing a management information systems for program modification.

It provides a sound footing for both program development and evaluation. Objectives provide a framework for organizing program operations and the feed-back information systems that enable programs to move toward pre-determined targets.

The adequacy with which objectives are stated is a critical factor in determining the quality of information derived from evaluation. A stated objective serves to define the ground rules for the evaluation process. It gives focus to the evaluation process.

Among the operations that will be affected are the following:

(1) Data collection techniques
(2) Criteria or standard of performance
(3) Frustration level of evaluators

In some instances, programs cannot be evaluated because objectives were not clearly stated prior to the development of the program. This situation is seen in conglomerate type programs such as after school and summer programs in which any number of children participate in one or more activities that should in some way bring about overall improvement in school achievement, attitudes and attendance.

Typically, objectives are viewed as general statements of overall goals. As a case in point:

- To provide in-service training for elementary school teachers.

The best information that an evaluator can provide is to establish that in-service training, in fact, did or did not occur. Possibly, the actual number of sessions and number of teachers attending can be documented. The objective, however, does not put the administrator in a position of receiving information related to the effectiveness of the in-service training in bringing about specified changes in the teachers. The evaluator is not in a position to provide valid reliable information about strength and weaknesses of the operations. Consequently, no changes or even negative changes could resul from the inservice program. The objectives a stated point to a target, but lack of specificatio of specific outcomes in terms of the desired b haviors of teachers after exposure to the progra diminishes the yield from evaluation.

The relationship between objectives an evaluation is not limited to assessment of a fin product. Equally or even more important is th effect of pre-stated objectives on the capabilit to monitor program operations in light of ob jectives. If objectives are unambiguous an reasonably stated, they provide a basis for modi fying operations so that the program has reasonable chance to produce the product tha was initially intended. In too many cases, pro grams are discontinued before their treatment were delivered as planned. Consequently, th participants never fully benefited from the treat ment. As a case in point, the daily operations school may require reassignment of project per sonnel to other duties. If the period is prolonge the project treatment may be impaired in term of its capability to bring about behavior changes in participants. A classic example i volves teacher assistants who are taken out the classroom to act as hall guards, distributor of milk and field trip chaperons, instead of rein forcers of small group instruction.

In stating objectives, some of the followin guides should be considered.

(1) Be as specific as possible
(2) Describe the behavior you would lik to see the participant display
(3) Note the conditions under which the be havior should be performed
(4) Indicate by what means an objectiv will be attained
(5) Practice

To be evaluated, an objective must enabl an evaluator to select appropriate methods t collect and analyze data. To the extent that th is possible, the quality of information will b useful to project managers and agency admi istrators.

changes or even negative changes could result from the inservice program. The objectives as stated point to a target, but lack of specification of specific outcomes in terms of the desired behaviors of teachers after exposure to the program diminishes the yield from evaluation.

The relationship between objectives and evaluation is not limited to assessment of a final product. Equally or even more important is the effect of pre-stated objectives on the capability to monitor program operations in light of objectives. If objectives are unambiguous and reasonably stated, they provide a basis for modifying operations so that the program has a reasonable chance to produce the product that was initially intended. In too many cases, programs are discontinued before their treatments were delivered as planned. Consequently, the participants never fully benefited from the treatment. As a case in point, the daily operations of school may require reassignment of project personnel to other duties. If the period is prolonged the project treatment may be impaired in terms of its capability to bring about behavioral changes in participants. A classic example involves teacher assistants who are taken out of the classroom to act as hall guards, distributors of milk and field trip chaperons, instead of reinforcers of small group instruction.

In stating objectives, some of the following guides should be considered.

(1) Be as specific as possible

(2) Describe the behavior you would like to see the participant display

(3) Note the conditions under which the behavior should be performed

(4) Indicate by what means an objective will be attained

(5) Practice

To be evaluated, an objective must enable an evaluator to select appropriate methods to collect and analyze data. To the extent that this is possible, the quality of information will be useful to project managers and agency administrators.

Program Creation and Implementation Is Not the First Step or Measure Twice and Cut Once

After needs have been identified and realistic objectives have been developed, agency staff is in a reasonable position to create a program or programs that are designed to attain the objectives. At the heart of the planning process is the development of a proposal. Essentially a proposal is a written document, a map, a blueprint in which the basic element of program operations, objectives, costs, personnel and time schedules are spelled out. Additional comment related to the sections of a proposal are not necessary for this audience. The basic reason for calling attention to the proposal is that it serves as a fundamental planning vehicle. Among its assets to you as an agency administrator are the following:

(1) It serves as a communication device to inform key staff members about the objectives and operational design of the program. Issues and conflicts between related programs can be surfaced and resolved so that programs do not duplicate efforts or create problems for each other.

(2) Proposals can be used to share and exchange ideas with other agencies.

(3) The proposal contains main elements of programmatic operations thus providing the program manager with a starting point and guide for program development.

(4) It serves as a historical document showing program development and change over a period of time.

In one document, agency administrators can get at the significant elements of a program. It is a rare moment when an administrator can put his hands on information about what a program should do, how it was to be done, when it was to occur and how the adequacy of program effectiveness will be determined.

Though proposal development is not a mysterious art, it requires practiced skill and time.

Since the availability of funds for special programs is usually contingent upon submission of a proposal, it is important that each agency develop an in-house capability to write proposals. A haphazard assignment to various staff members will reduce chances for receiving significant amounts of funds for programs.

In those instances in which it is not practical to divert present staff or employ full time personnel every effort should be made to develop a continuing relationship with a part time proposal writer who is knowledgeable about the agency.

Evaluation – A Way To Improve the Quality of Information For Decision Makers

The main point that will be made in this section borders on a gross over-simplification of the problem. In a nutshell it is this. As administrators you need better information to improve your decision-making capability. While money is available from state and federal sources, serious consideration should be given to training members of your staff or employing new staff members who bring evaluation skills. Evaluation is not an accidental occurrence. Neither will its value to your agencies be revealed overnight. As with any other worthwhile operation in your agencies, evaluation requires time, talent, skill and resources. A flash of mirrors and wishing are neither adequate or sufficient.

Essentially evaluation is a process which enables an organization to look at program operations and program outcomes in relation to the objectives that any given project was designed to attain.

In too many instances administrators become discouraged because the installation of an evaluation capability seems unattainable. The agreement generally emphasizes that trained personnel are scarce.

Furthermore, field settings such as those represented by agencies, do not lend themselves to experimental control designs, random assignment to treatment and valid measurement of independent and dependent variables. To a degree the arguments against building a systematic evaluation capability are based in fact. However, the alternatives, in light of increasing opportunities to obtain funds for special programs, are to create programs whose chances of attaining objectives are weighted more by accident than deliberate plan.

Though it may not be possible for every agency to develop highly sophisticated evaluation capabilities, each agency can take some first steps that may eventually develop into a significant part of agency operations. These first steps involve the following:

(1) Assign a staff member, who has interest and at least minimal training, the responsibility to develop and write the evaluation section of proposals written by your agency.

(2) Allow this staff member to sharpen his or her skills by attending appropriate meetings and training.

(3) As chief administrator of an agency, take advantage of opportunities to read and attend meetings which will increase your knowledge about systematic evaluation so that you can gain insights into using the output of evaluation.

(4) As chief administrator create an environment for the evaluator so that he or she can function as an evaluator.

(5) Though experimental research designs may not be possible in all instances, organize a procedure so the following activities become standard operating procedure with every special program.
   (a) develop clearly stated *objectives* so that expected outcomes are clear to everyone.
   (b) measure status of participants as objectively as possible at point of entry to the program and at point of other milestone moments.
   (c) arrange for observation of program operations so that they are consistent with project objectives.
   (d) allow
   come
   that
   a ba

(6) Organize
   sponsibil
   developi
   ning Co
   for maki
   priority
   tives and

The preceding
your agency prob
a position to pla
gram more syste
mentation of the
greater awareness
tives. Program op
in relation to obj
sistency between
program.

Development – Concept

Public agenci
with the erroneo
grams must be s
fortunately, succe
of criteria and at
It is only withi
– that a growing
of development

Essentially, d
means to attain p
ucts. It involves
of a program a
Program develop
program in its fi
quate and suffici
modification of
chances of attai
As with planning
requires valid, r
for reaching deci

Program eval
gaining this info
decision points. T

ment to treatment and valid measurement of independent and dependent variables. To a degree the arguments against building a systematic evaluation capability are based in fact. However, the alternatives, in light of increasing opportunities to obtain funds for special programs, are to create programs whose chances of attaining objectives are weighted more by accident than deliberate plan.

Though it may not be possible for every agency to develop highly sophisticated evaluation capabilities, each agency can take some first steps that may eventually develop into a significant part of agency operations. These first steps involve the following:

(1) Assign a staff member, who has interest and at least minimal training, the responsibility to develop and write the evaluation section of proposals written by your agency.

(2) Allow this staff member to sharpen his or her skills by attending appropriate meetings and training.

(3) As chief administrator of an agency, take advantage of opportunities to read and attend meetings which will increase your knowledge about systematic evaluation so that you can gain insights into using the output of evaluation.

(4) As chief administrator create an environment for the evaluator so that he or she can function as an evaluator.

(5) Though experimental research designs may not be possible in all instances, organize a procedure so the following activities become standard operating procedure with every special program.
   (a) develop clearly stated *objectives* so that expected outcomes are clear to everyone.
   (b) measure status of participants as objectively as possible at point of entry to the program and at point of other milestone moments.
   (c) arrange for observation of program operations so that they are consistent with project objectives.
   (d) allow the evaluation reports to become part of a feedback system so that valid evaluative finds serve as a basis for program modification.

(6) Organize a Planning Committee with responsibility for identifying, creating and developing special programs. This Planning Committee can provide a vehicle for making recommendations related to priority needs, identification of objectives and general program development.

The preceding six steps will not solve all of your agency problems, but they can put you in a position to plan, evaluate and develop program more systematically. The serious implementation of these six steps should lead to a greater awareness of program goals and objectives. Program operations will tend to be viewed in relation to objectives with emphasis on consistency between outcomes and operations of a program.

Development – A Misunderstood Concept

Public agencies have labored and suffered with the erroneous belief that all special programs must be successful on their first try. Unfortunately, success has not been defined in terms of criteria and attainment of specified outcomes. It is only within recent months – almost days – that a growing understanding of the concept of development is starting to take root.

Essentially, development is a process or a means to attain predetermined outcomes or products. It involves more than writing a description of a program and implementing it as written. Program development rejects the idea that a program in its first phases of operation is adequate and sufficient. It anticipates change and modification of program operations so that chances of attaining objectives are maximized. As with planning and evaluation, development requires valid, reliable information as a basis for reaching decisions about program operations.

Program evaluation provides one means of gaining this information and feeding it back at decision points. This feedback serves as a means

for identifying elements of program operations that are not consistent with attainment of objectives. Having access to this type of information about program operations, the program manager or agency administrator can give consideration to weak elements of operations. As appropriate modifications are made in operations, the chances of attaining objectives in terms of outcomes increase. Continuous development of program operations during the pilot or initial phases of a program is important in that it enables the evaluator to describe the ingredients of a program when and if they are actually in effect. Too often programs have been initiated but staff has not been trained or materials have not arrived, consequently the full potential of the program treatment has not been in effect. If an evaluation is conducted, it will probably indicate that objectives have not been attained, the program was not successful, when in reality the program was never delivered in full force. The process of development is synonymous with program refinement or modification. It provides a means for arranging program content and operations so that the outcomes or products of the program can be evaluated with assurance that a describable program treatment was actually delivered.

In order to initiate a developmental approach to program operations, a mechanism must be established in an agency to translate evaluative information into program modification. A planning committee meeting at regular times and composed of key agency staff can serve as a practical means for reaching decisions related to program modification. In some instances the agency administrator may wish to work directly with program managers to reach decisions about program development.

The vehicle for operationalizing a developmental point of view in any agency depends largely upon the partialities of the chief administrator.

Once installed as a standard operating procedure, it provides a systematic way to engage in closing the gap between program objectives and operations.

Perspective

Planning–Evaluation–Development describe an orientation or a way of doing things. Taken together they provide an effective means for key agency personnel to be involved in program selection, installation, evaluation and development.

It can be started as a "do it yourself project." If several top administrators are committed to improving the Planning – Evaluation – Development capability in an agency it will take root and grow.

With time and experience goals become more visible to all levels of staff. In turn their efforts may become directed more effectively toward outcomes that are consistent with the mission of your agency. No panacea, no short cuts, no instant answers, but a reasonable approach to do a better job. Planning–Evaluation–Development represents not only a response but an initiative to operational needs and realities.

Saturation English

Walter T. Stamp

The program I am going to present to you is a relatively new one principally directed toward deprived and delinquent children.

In 1964, Dr. Daniel Fader, professor of English at the University of Michigan, developed the program entitled, "English in Every Classroom." Dr. Fader's purpose in developing this program was his dissatisfaction with the way English was being taught in many of the state's public school systems. As an educator, who at that time was involved in accreditation of English in many of the public schools, it was Dr. Fader's view that teaching English in the schools was a waste of time to a large group of the children attending them. This large group was the non-academically motivated, non-college bound student.

The principle purpose of Dr. Fader's idea of the teaching of English was that he envisioned a plan whereby he could assist teachers in teaching the non-academically motivated students in terms of giving them useful and satisfying answers as to why English was useful to them. The main approach to learning in the program was primarily to motivate students as well as the reinforcement of literacy. The basis of the program was that the problem was not primarily one of literacy or intelligence, but one of motivation. In order for Dr. Fader to put his concepts to work, one of the first things he had to do was to find a school in which he could test his ideas.

In 1964 he found such a school in the W. J. Maxey Boys Training School located at Whitmore Lake, Michigan. The school suited Dr. Fader's purposes for several reasons, the first of which was that the school had not yet developed an over-all curriculum in either the academic or vocational areas. Second, the population make-up of the school was to consist primarily of non-academically motivated, and non-college bound students. Third, the staffing of this institution was to be comprised of young and viable instructors who could relate well to these youths.

The introduction of Dr. Fader's concept, called "English In Every Classroom," into the Maxey Boys Training School curriculum was based on the dual concepts of "Saturation and Diffusion." Saturation, as Dr. Fader envisioned it, proposed to surround the student with newspapers, magazines and paperbound books. By doing this, it was felt that the student would eventually perceive them as pleasurable means to necessary ends. The second of the two major concepts "Diffusion," as implied in its name, refers to the responsibility of every teacher in the program to make it an operational reality. In making the concept of Diffusion a reality, all of our instructors became intermediators between the students and functional literacy. In short, all of our instructors in every classroom, whether vocational or academic, became teachers of English.

To implement the two key concepts that Dr. Fader speaks of in all of the classrooms, a number of steps were followed to insure operational success:

1. A paperback library consisting of over 7,400 books of various subjects and titles was created.
2. Daily newspapers and magazines in large quantities were obtained for use in all classrooms, including the library on a regular basis.
3. Dictionaries and writing journals were given to all students, including new students as they come into the school program.
4. Regular meetings, comprised of small academic and vocational groups, were scheduled with individual English teachers serving as coordinators for the meetings.

An important aspect of this program is the emphasis that is placed on writing. It was Dr. Fader's feeling that students for the most part learn how to write through the actual experi-

students. Third, the staffing of this institution was to be comprised of young and viable instructors who could relate well to these youths.

The introduction of Dr. Fader's concept, called "English In Every Classroom," into the Maxey Boys Training School curriculum was based on the dual concepts of "Saturation and Diffusion." Saturation, as Dr. Fader envisioned it, proposed to surround the student with newspapers, magazines and paperbound books. By doing this, it was felt that the student would eventually perceive them as pleasurable means to necessary ends. The second of the two major concepts "Diffusion," as implied in its name, refers to the responsibility of every teacher in the program to make it an operational reality. In making the concept of Diffusion a reality, all of our instructors became intermediators between the students and functional literacy. In short, all of our instructors in every classroom, whether vocational or academic, became teachers of English.

To implement the two key concepts that Dr. Fader speaks of in all of the classrooms, a number of steps were followed to insure operational success:

1. A paperback library consisting of over 7,400 books of various subjects and titles was created.
2. Daily newspapers and magazines in large quantities were obtained for use in all classrooms, including the library on a regular basis.
3. Dictionaries and writing journals were given to all students, including new students as they come into the school program.
4. Regular meetings, comprised of small academic and vocational groups, were scheduled with individual English teachers serving as coordinators for the meetings.

An important aspect of this program is the emphasis that is placed on writing. It was Dr. Fader's feeling that students for the most part learn how to write through the actual experience of writing. He likened this approach to the athlete who continually practices and exercises to build his coordination and muscles to attain top performance. Writing, he maintains, also needs to be practiced continually if a person is to build good writing skills. With this concept in mind, a system was established whereby students were asked to write for ten or fifteen minutes in each of the classes they attended during the day. Students writing in this mandatory system could either write what they thought or copy articles or items from newspapers or magazines that were supplied to all classrooms. In most instances these papers were not checked for grammatical content, but rather for volume.

The journal, as a part of the writing program, has an equally important part in Dr. Fader's concepts. All students, as stated before, are given journals to be used in their English classes on a continuing basis until they terminate from the school program. The purpose of the journal is to provide the student with a field upon which he can practice his writing. The students are required to write a minimum number of two pages each week. At the end of each week these journals are turned into the English teachers and checked for quantity and nothing else. Aside from the principle purpose of writing exercise and practice that students get from the utilization of the journal, there are other benefits that are derived. In an institutional setting such as Maxey where students come to us as socially maladjusted offenders, there are in many instances feelings of inadequacy, fear and hatred in their personality make-up. The journal in many instances provides these youths with a vehicle to vent many of these feelings. While this approach works well in an institutional setting such as Maxey, it has on the other hand created a few problems in some public schools. The chief reason for this appears to be that a staff who is trained especially to deal with emotional problems of youths is much more prepared and willing to endure abrasive and critical remarks made about them in the journals. Aside from this, the English instructor must remember that whatever a student writes in his journal is

privileged information as between a lawyer and his client.

Dr. Fader's views on reading in the Maxey school program are similar to that of his concepts on writing. His belief is that students are not likely to learn to read unless reading is made a part of his entire curricular environment. The program at the school therefore requires that all teachers base a large part of their course content and a portion of their written exercises upon textbooks designed to invite and encourage reading. The textbooks that Dr. Fader refers to are newspapers, magazines and paperbound books that reflect the non-school world in the classroom. This reliance on what Dr. Fader refers to as non-school materials is based on what he feels are two distinct advantages. First, the traditional view of the textbook he feels should be expanded to include many appropriate paperback books and periodicals being published today. Secondly, another great advantage of the softcover (paperback) is that it is easily portable and is by its very nature an invitation to possession and casual reading. If one were to take a good look at the environments that most of our youth come from, they would find that most of the reading material that they come in contact with in a pleasurable sense is found to be the book and magazine racks at the local drug, newsstand and dime stores. With these concepts in mind, the reading program at the school is operating on the basis of a continual acquisition of large amounts of current magazines, newspapers and paperbacks. Classroom assignments in many instances are based on information to be obtained from these materials. The acquisition of these materials has been worked out by obtaining some through donations from magazine and paperback wholesalers, newspaper publishers, and funds from our operating budget for other materials.

The library facility of the Maxey School is an important part of the overall concept of the "English In Every Classroom" program. Dr. Fader in his approach to the library system urges the same basic reconsideration be applied that he advocates for the teaching of
and writing. The library system operatin
ently in the Maxey School is aimed at
ing the problems of space, visual appe
reading activity. The general decorum o
brary area is based on the concept that lib
could learn much from operators of pa
bookstores, who have learned to let the
chandise sell itself. The appeal of surr
the student with colorful and highly des
paperback books has had much to do w
success of the library and the motiva
reading. From an operational standpoi
dents are permitted to check out thre
at a time. English classes are scheduled i
library on a systematic basis with the
instructor charged with the responsibi
checking in and out the material read b
students.

Up to this point I have talked abo
initial steps and concepts that went in
creation and operation of Dr. Fader's p
back in 1964. Since that time a num
changes have occured for a number of r
In summarizing this talk, I will attempt t
out some of these changes, both positi
negative in nature. As a result, perhaps
of you who plan to adopt the "English In
Classroom" concept in whole or in pa
learn from our experiences with it.

A. The over-all concept of having writi
reading in all of the classrooms, alt
theoretically good, requires a high
of communication and cooperatio
tween staff and the various depa
chairmen. Added to this, the necess
continual training for new staff has
this aspect cumbersome. As a res
reading and writing aspects of th
gram have been limited to those
(Social Studies and English) that
the most benefit from it.

B. The concept of the all paperback l
remains with us to this day. In ter
motivation, in getting students to
it is highly successful. Major critic

that he advocates for the teaching of reading and writing. The library system operating presently in the Maxey School is aimed at alleviating the problems of space, visual appeal and reading activity. The general decorum of the library area is based on the concept that librarians could learn much from operators of paperback bookstores, who have learned to let their merchandise sell itself. The appeal of surrounding the student with colorful and highly descriptive paperback books has had much to do with the success of the library and the motivation of reading. From an operational standpoint, students are permitted to check out three books at a time. English classes are scheduled into the library on a systematic basis with the English instructor charged with the responsibility of checking in and out the material read by their students.

Up to this point I have talked about the initial steps and concepts that went into the creation and operation of Dr. Fader's program back in 1964. Since that time a number of changes have occured for a number of reasons. In summarizing this talk, I will attempt to point out some of these changes, both positive and negative in nature. As a result, perhaps those of you who plan to adopt the "English In Every Classroom" concept in whole or in part can learn from our experiences with it.

A. The over-all concept of having writing and reading in all of the classrooms, although theoretically good, requires a high degree of communication and cooperation between staff and the various department chairmen. Added to this, the necessity for continual training for new staff has made this aspect cumbersome. As a result the reading and writing aspects of the program have been limited to those classes (Social Studies and English) that derive the most benefit from it.

B. The concept of the all paperback library remains with us to this day. In terms of motivation, in getting students to read, it is highly successful. Major criticism at this point appears to be that, although it appears to offer a wide range of reading material to high and middle academically oriented readers, the selection and help that it gives to low and non-readers is limited. Another drawback is the apparent lack of care and responsibility that students attach to the paperback. This attitude is one that appears to exist in connection with many of the goods and materials we utilize in everyday life. The cost on the other hand of purchasing hardbound editions of certain books available in paperback appears to offset the wear and tear factor. In some instances it is possible to obtain three or four paperbacks for the price of one hardbound edition. This also means that greater distribution is available with more paperback editions.

C. The journal aspect of Dr. Fader's program is one that has proven to be highly successful and rewarding. As mentioned before, the therapeutic, as well as the writing assignment value of the journal, has led us to keep this facet of the program unchanged.

D. After a thorough examination of Dr. Fader's program, it is apparent to many English instructors that this program is an extension or adaptation of an "Individualized Approach To Reading." It is the opinion of this speaker that as a singular approach to the problems of reading and writing, the Fader concept is excellent but by no means the only answer. Just as a good English instructor utilizes many approaches to learning in his classrooms, the systems that are conducive to learning should also be varied.

For those who wish to obtain more in-depth detail about the "English In Every Classroom" program, I would suggest a book written by Dr. Fader entitled *Hooked On Books: Program and Proof*.

The Manager as Social Scientist

Edward J. Stainbrook, M.D.

I took as my topic, "The Manager as Social Scientist." One of the determinants of that is historical. About 30 years ago, Julian Huxley wrote that the managers of the future would have to be social scientists. I would submit to you that the prediction has now come true. You can infer different meanings at different contemporary levels. We might start here to prove another saying, that is, an artist is not in advance of his group, he is merely the first one to know what is happening to it.

Among all the crises that we can designate, being the way in which we label the contemporary culture, we might suggest that we are in a crisis of conceptualization because we are now trying frantically to integrate the burgeoning knowledge about ourselves which is being produced by the scientists. Every profession must change its practice in accordance with what it knows. Therefore, the increased need to know what is happening to us comes from the way in which we are studying ourselves and conceptualizing ourselves.

In the last 20 years – even in the last five or ten years – we have returned to an understanding and an acceptance of the fact that medically each one of us is unique, that we are born with a lot of already programmed possibilities for behavior, some memory patterns which are inherent in our bodies, bespeaking awareness in which the body is programmed under its long evolutionary history. To function, we must recognize that so many of these inborn problem ways of behaving, while they evolve out of our adapted utility, are now, paradoxically, becoming maladaptive. We had a need to control the external environment, and now comes the added need to find the ways in which we can use this evolved biological behavior that, left to itself and without cultural direction, is assuming increasingly maladaptive forms.

For example, there is the whole proble the fat-transport metabolism aspect of the which evolved early because man did n very well or very frequently. As a consequ it was good whenever you found any fo scrounge up as much of it as you cou quickly as you could. Now, in a very real this inborn mechanism for fat transport coming maladaptive.

Then we have the problem of how to c the maladaptive aspects of our evolved biol behavior. It is becoming maladaptive an have a problem of how to control it by and other kinds of intervention. This, then additional problems for us.

The reason, I believe, is our increasi ceptance of the fact that we are bodies. W James asked the proper question in his ples. "Are they ours or are they us?" Obv our bodies are not ours, but are they us viously if the bodies are not ours, it is on bad syntactical import of the English lan that makes us think that we have a body are a body. Bodies become humanized, ized, and experience-organized with all genetic uniqueness, and this is an org process. Increasingly our understanding behavioral change must be informed. We understand that we are bodies, that these are genetically programmed and unique that we are only obeying contemporary g as we understand them, not pessimistic ge

The 19th Century geneticist said, "Whe are born you are done for." Obviously who attained some further development buy that.

We also made all kinds of facile propos one being that one's genes control one' People interested in behavioral change buy that because they knew that most were the result of a learning process, an basis of most all of them is basic bette of every trait. The contemporary geneticis "Sure, you are born genetically unique, b these patterns for understanding of uniq and setting up environmental compensati so that the vulnerability issues in real i ment and in many other ways." And the o

For example, there is the whole problem of the fat-transport metabolism aspect of the body which evolved early because man did not eat very well or very frequently. As a consequence, it was good whenever you found any food to scrounge up as much of it as you could as quickly as you could. Now, in a very real sense, this inborn mechanism for fat transport is becoming maladaptive.

Then we have the problem of how to control the maladaptive aspects of our evolved biological behavior. It is becoming maladaptive and we have a problem of how to control it by social and other kinds of intervention. This, then, poses additional problems for us.

The reason, I believe, is our increasing acceptance of the fact that we are bodies. William James asked the proper question in his Principles. "Are they ours or are they us?" Obviously our bodies are not ours, but are they us? Obviously if the bodies are not ours, it is only the bad syntactical import of the English language that makes us think that we have a body. We are a body. Bodies become humanized, socialized, and experience-organized with all their genetic uniqueness, and this is an organized process. Increasingly our understanding of the behavioral change must be informed. We must understand that we are bodies, that these bodies are genetically programmed and unique, and that we are only obeying contemporary genetics as we understand them, not pessimistic genetics.

The 19th Century geneticist said, "When you are born you are done for." Obviously people who attained some further development didn't buy that.

We also made all kinds of facile propositions, one being that one's genes control one's fate. People interested in behavioral change didn't buy that because they knew that most traits were the result of a learning process, and the basis of most all of them is basic betterment of every trait. The contemporary geneticist says, "Sure, you are born genetically unique, but all these patterns for understanding of uniqueness and setting up environmental compensation are so that the vulnerability issues in real impairment and in many other ways." And the optimist is beginning to accept our bodies, I think, as being increasingly important to us.

That may seem a little way from the whole problem of managing an institution. Yet the basic course continues, that is, when you are managing people and managing behavioral problems, you are managing bodies. Indeed, in bodies that do not change, nothing changes.

Because learning does occur and behavioral change does take place, by definition there must be some change in biological processes and particularly in the neurological-physiological. This increased knowledge, I think, is going to give us an added way of monitoring the result, the outcome of what we do. Here is all this motor knowledge and molecular knowledge being involved, and at the same time, we have shifted our attention to the ways in which these bodies become humanized and socialized as everybody becomes humanized and socialized. Sometimes the human transaction which occurs in some kind of a social setting can be defined as belonging to or part of, formally or informally, some sort of social institution which has a structure and which has processes going on within it. Of course, the more superordinating directive for all of this is the cultural value system which provides the information that says how the social organizations believe in themselves, so that they can control the behavior of persons, and how this social contact affects even biological processes, of which it is said, "A value can get modified in the guts of the living."

Obviously, you can talk about all behavior of central beings as energy transformation in the body under the direction of information. Some of this information is genetically given and comes out of the cell nutrients and is portrayed by activity itself. Some of the information comes out of the past experience recorded in the person; some of that information is coming from an appraisal of the here and now; and some of that information is also coming from an appraisal of the future.

Here, again, I think I have added a dimension that behavior scientists and other persons interested in behavioral science do not put enough emphasis on: the determinations of past upon

present. The science is just now moving into a consideration of here and now problems of behavior. I would suggest that one should not attribute the behavior of persons in a social setting to anything else except that social setting, when you know that social setting is not creating the social behavior that you observe. You see, this is a little bit different from expressing that no matter where you are, the unconscious is always there repetitively seeking to be out. Never mind the contemporary here and now, just try to understand how it was.

I am not, however, throwing out understanding of our past determinations with the bath. All of us, I think, are agreeing increasingly that optimum conditioning of the here and now transactions may be much more important than we were willing to admit 10 or 15 years ago. But I am also suggesting, therefore, that the present is the cause of the present and that the future is the cause of the present. As Professor Wohl already suggested years ago at MIT, there may be a generation without a future, but, in any event, that is no newly-made discovery nor is it a basis of speculation as to the appraisal of the future. When we appraise their future, we are bound to that future even with anger, with despair, or with distress.

I question very much whether the rational procedure is to try to treat them out of their realistic scan of the future, or whether it might not be best to try to create a future which one scans and uses something like hope and excitement, or be willing to tolerate oppression, feeling that one has some place to go. Even the future construction of a society becomes part of the concern when we think about what we are trying to arrange, what kind of a place we are trying to arrange for the person whose behavior we are trying to change.

Assessing Current Social Trends

For the last 20 or 30 years, in modern European and American civilization, there has been an increasing attempt to try to control all behavior by subsuming it under the rhetoric of illness. This has been a significant gain, because, other things being equal, if the behavior is being responded to with compassion and with understanding, it is much better to label deviate behavior an illness than it is to label it something else. It also tends to train the eye of scientific study and imagination in trying to understand it, and, as we do so psychiatrically, we must take a position toward it factorially. What has come out of this has not been progressive. In effect, we say, "It is better to continue this trend of subsuming all deviate behavior under the rubric of illness, primarily of psychiatric illness, and therefore, we give everybody a psychiatric disease." Because we overwhelm ourselves with the increasing number of persons whose distress we call illness, we find ourselves trying heroically to water down our treatment responses, bringing in other sources of accessory personnel, all operating under the disease model and all being intimidated somewhat by the idea that whatever they do in the transaction with a person is designed to somehow ameliorate him or help him, and this can somehow be called therapy. Therapy obviously is still the province of a very definite professional qualification.

The other way to go would be to resolve the crises of conceptualization, and question whether or not a good deal of what we call distress is indeed a psychiatric illness, what kind of disease model we are going to use, and if it is a rational disease model to use. The important thing is that we need more adequate disease models as well as a willingness not to use the disease model when it is not rational and appropriate.

Look how widely we have used the disease model. For example, a recent study of 150 children in New York City showed that 75% of those children in the first grade were demonstrably anxious, and their behavior was definitely affected by their expression of that anxiety. Another 10% were significantly apathetic, or what was called depressed.

It may very well be that these responses are responses to the surroundings and to the life situation and that, therefore, the rational way to change these responses is not to designate individuals as psychiatrically ill but rather to alter their social surroundings and the interactions of

responded to with compassion and with understanding, it is much better to label deviate behavior an illness than it is to label it something else. It also tends to train the eye of scientific study and imagination in trying to understand it, and, as we do so psychiatrically, we must take a position toward it factorially. What has come out of this has not been progressive. In effect, we say, "It is better to continue this trend of subsuming all deviate behavior under the rubric of illness, primarily of psychiatric illness, and therefore, we give everybody a psychiatric disease." Because we overwhelm ourselves with the increasing number of persons whose distress we call illness, we find ourselves trying heroically to water down our treatment responses, bringing in other sources of accessory personnel, all operating under the disease model and all being intimidated somewhat by the idea that whatever they do in the transaction with a person is designed to somehow ameliorate him or help him, and this can somehow be called therapy. Therapy obviously is still the province of a very definite professional qualification.

The other way to go would be to resolve the crises of conceptualization, and question whether or not a good deal of what we call distress is indeed a psychiatric illness, what kind of disease model we are going to use, and if it is a rational disease model to use. The important thing is that we need more adequate disease models as well as a willingness not to use the disease model when it is not rational and appropriate.

Look how widely we have used the disease model. For example, a recent study of 150 children in New York City showed that 75% of those children in the first grade were demonstrably anxious, and their behavior was definitely affected by their expression of that anxiety. Another 10% were significantly apathetic, or what was called depressed.

It may very well be that these responses are responses to the surroundings and to the life situation and that, therefore, the rational way to change these responses is not to designate individuals as psychiatrically ill but rather to alter their social surroundings and the interactions of the social transactions that go on between them and those surroundings.

I would suggest that there are too few psychiatrists in state hospitals and in all other hospitals there is an overload of psychiatrists and an underload of psychologists who know how to use the social process for resocialization. The name "hospital" is undoubtedly a matter of semantics, maybe a misnomer. When you call something a hospital, you have to show that medical attention is given. I believe one of the great difficulties holding up the development of the contemporary large psychiatric hospital is the designation of hospital. The large psychiatric hospital is a specific designation of a hospital. We have moved from custodial institutions to therapeutic institutions, and we now must move to mental development institutions. When you move to developmental institutions, you do not have to exhaust all your energies, as little as they may be, in futile attempts to play out the doctor-patient game with individual patients.

That is the trend of the time, which is inevitably going to come to psychiatric hospitals, as well as to penal institutions. In social developmental institutions people can come to learn any thing they need to learn in order to be resourceful, adaptive human beings. Such institutions do not have to be monitored under the ideal of the disease model by physicians because most of the transactions are therapeutic.

The Social Therapist

All of my life I have been a director of some sort of psychiatric hospital. If every one of my patients could have the kind of experience he needs at the time he needs it, then obviously I would be managing the hospital as a therapeutic agent. I would like to see administrators consider themselves real social therapists, not merely administrators, because, in a sense, the social contemporary administrator is treating with the whole institution.

Let's consider the relationship when one goes into an organization to do this particular task. Obviously, you bring your individual self, but your self behaves within the organization not in

terms of psychodynamic factors or idiosyncratic factors alone, but also in consideration of the organic life. You will want to assess the individual behavior of everyone in your organization, understanding that self plus social role enactment equals individual behavior. The question then is how much of that social role enactment is producing the behavior that you might want to look at, facilitate, or suppress, and how much of it is a matter of the idiosyncratic self. You know that the role of being a patient depends on the hospital or any kind of institution, not only in the terms of behavior of that individual, but more importantly because role enactment always turns into self-conceptualization and self-improvement, and the self grows out of the social role it enacts. Merton suggested some time ago that if you worked for 18 to 20 years in the bureaucracy, you developed a bureaucratic personality when you were off the job.

The institution gets into you, too, and in this sense, you have this self-taught role enactment which indicates the real behavior icon leading to an analysis of the importance of role-producing behavior and how much of it has to do with the individual self.

Frequently in the psychiatric hospital I have seen an attempt made to supervise residents or psychiatrists without asking questions such as "I wonder how the role that this resident is playing in this organization and the role that the staff is playing are acting together? How much are the role conditions responsible for the behavior that goes on between them, out of which may come a supervisory problem, and how much of it is a psychodynamic picture?"

Usually it is said, "Well, you know, you are having difficulty with the patient, or the patient is having difficulty with you," rather than asking, "I wonder what are the social conditions of this transaction that may be causing this circumstance?" This question can be applied in the teaching circumstance. It can be applied in the administration of every organization.

Let us say that I have a nurse or a teacher in the organization and, generally, she is doing the organizational task. We will assume also that

Edward J. Stainbrook and

she is doing what is best to do from the motivational standpoint. That may be a rare employee, but let's assume it as a possibility.

How can this motivational state be changed? It can be changed by things that are going on in the biological processes of the body, either directly related to the internal stimuli or external stimuli.

Motivation can also change because of internal situations which may have no relationship to what is going on around us. The motivation can also be changed by external circumstances.

In order to make this concept as tangible as possible, let's use a nurse in charge of a ward as an example. As you know, the charge nurse in a ward supervises all the rest of the nursing crew throughout the 24 hours, and all the ancillary personnel, the teaching organization and also the medical students. She is an executive of considerable span of control.

Above her in the organization will come four or five superordinating figures: the business man-

Edward J. Stainbrook and Raymond A. Horn

she is doing what is best to do from the motivational standpoint. That may be a rare employee, but let's assume it as a possibility.

How can this motivational state be changed? It can be changed by things that are going on in the biological processes of the body, either directly related to the internal stimuli or external stimuli.

Motivation can also change because of internal situations which may have no relationship to what is going on around us. The motivation can also be changed by external circumstances.

In order to make this concept as tangible as possible, let's use a nurse in charge of a ward as an example. As you know, the charge nurse in a ward supervises all the rest of the nursing crew throughout the 24 hours, and all the ancillary personnel, the teaching organization and also the medical students. She is an executive of considerable span of control.

Above her in the organization will come four or five superordinating figures: the business manager who is generally a man of great power because of the nature of the organization and the political implications; the medical director who, until recently, was only a staff situation in a hospital situation with reference to the business director; the director of nursing services; and the director of nursing education. All have power to send directives down to the charge nurse.

If the charge nurse, however, gets some directive which she can accept only with suspicion, she may very well – just from the very nature of the system – change and become motivated by anger and maybe a little anxiety. The nurse responds with anxiety and anger or both, and she now delivers the end result with a lot of resentment. That might not change the overt task doing. If you were observing, you might not see very much change, but the para-verbal communication that went along with the passivity might hold considerable change, and even the verbal might alter a little bit. This is bound to have certain implications in terms of the patient's understanding and response.

This is by no means confined to nurses. However, this is the position of the nurse in an organization which, by its structure creates conflict situations to which persons normally react with anxiety and anger.

The nurse may spread this disaffection throughout the hospital. She may call her friends together on the ward and create a localized abscess of emotional disaffection resulting in lowered morale. Other adaptations would cause the person to seek ways to discharge her resentment either in task-doing or sometimes by altering that task-doing.

Other things can happen to teachers and nurses, to physicians, to assistant directors, to directors, to everybody in an organization, and over a long period of time, to patients, in the sense that when you avert conflict in any situation and create anger, you may have psychosomatic aberrations and implications. Many employees go home at the end of the day complaining of undue fatigue, and being very, very tired.

There is another secondary aspect of this change of consequence which was not obvious at the beginning – if you go home depressed, tired, empty, then, of course, alcohol may become one of the ways to redress that distress. One may say there are circumstances under which alcoholic beverage achieves something which is organizationally engendered, so that is one of the issues.

Another issue obviously would be that one needs a more permanent adaptation to this concept anxiety situation. If I don't want to be made anxious by the organizational conditions of life, then, obviously, I can start saying, "Well, I will listen, but I won't respond emotionally." That is to say, "I won't care. I won't be de-emotionalized by participation in the organization. I will refuse responsibility."

In this circumstance, one may find that people begin to do the job perfunctorily with low commitments to the organizational task, and by taking much less responsibility.

These are just some of the things that go on in organizations. We all know these, I think, quite well, but I have been in organizations enough to know that so much of this is take just the natural and necessarily durable c quence of how people come together. How if you are trying to moderate and mana social system which is going, hopefully, behavioral change, in education and in treat processes, and in helping processes, prim what you have to offer are obviously the ser but the services are not necessarily medical services are experiences, and what experien one offering? Hopefully, one is offering gr experiences, resocialization experiences, lear and developmental experiences. The real ta management is to organize the social syste that these experiences can happen with the interference from the development state of sons implementing those experiences.

In this sense, one has to be aware o whole system and what one needs to do in to keep it flexible, viable, open, and respo to his needs.

Effectiveness and Efficiency

It seems to me that one important deriv of this kind of thinking is that we have to a distinction between efficiency and effectiv They are not the same. An organization ca efficient and not be very effective.

There is no evidence that sympathetic t ing or any managerial seminars relating to h relationships have contributed to any orga tion. Yet this hasn't stopped businesses using this type of instrumentality to pr units which are continuing to use such tra tactics. They use them, perhaps, for other poses than teaching sensitivity to personnel. a way of training employees in an organiz without too much trouble, and it may be of therapeutic experience for persons who been demoted.

What I am getting at here is, if you imbed in the organization a regular, on- opportunity for people to say how it is with and to experience openly what they are in each other, then this would really be a dev mental institution for everybody.

quite well, but I have been in organizations long enough to know that so much of this is taken as just the natural and necessarily durable consequence of how people come together. However, if you are trying to moderate and manage a social system which is going, hopefully, into behavioral change, in education and in treatment processes, and in helping processes, primarily what you have to offer are obviously the services, but the services are not necessarily medical, the services are experiences, and what experience is one offering? Hopefully, one is offering growth experiences, resocialization experiences, learning and developmental experiences. The real task of management is to organize the social system so that these experiences can happen with the least interference from the development state of persons implementing those experiences.

In this sense, one has to be aware of the whole system and what one needs to do in order to keep it flexible, viable, open, and responsive to his needs.

Effectiveness and Efficiency

It seems to me that one important derivative of this kind of thinking is that we have to make a distinction between efficiency and effectiveness. They are not the same. An organization can be efficient and not be very effective.

There is no evidence that sympathetic training or any managerial seminars relating to human relationships have contributed to any organization. Yet this hasn't stopped businesses from using this type of instrumentality to produce units which are continuing to use such training tactics. They use them, perhaps, for other purposes than teaching sensitivity to personnel. It is a way of training employees in an organization without too much trouble, and it may be a sort of therapeutic experience for persons who have been demoted.

What I am getting at here is, if you could imbed in the organization a regular, on-going opportunity for people to say how it is with them and to experience openly what they are in with each other, then this would really be a developmental institution for everybody.

However, we know that increased knowledge and increased awareness does not necessarily make for effectiveness but, nevertheless, the person in the organization who does such things as adequately communicate provides those situations where people are allowed to give autonomy to their institutional task, as much as it can be given, so that one maximizes his participation. When you come back to putting managerial understanding of how you treat people in the system and what the system does to people, then I think we can return once more to what I was suggesting in the beginning.

For what we call deviate behavior or impaired behavior, the real regress is the provision of learning experiences which will change the behavior that we are looking at, reduce the impairment, or increase the social abilities of the person. In order to do that, the patient must have actual experiences, and moreover, one has to see that this increasingly has to be in the order of learning. We must stop thinking of our institutions in terms of what is the diagnosis and the diseases behind it, with all of the connotations being that if you don't know the ultimate power of the disease, you can't cure it. Cure is one of the most handicapping concepts one can have when you are dealing with the behavior of persons. If you are dealing with a disease like schizophrenia for which we do not know of any cure and the concept is that you can only discharge the person if he is cured, then obviously he is never going to get out. The cure concept is a limited one.

You must allocate to various persons the functions that are going to be used in facilitating change. I am suggesting that in our institutions we have not studied ourselves from the standpoint of effectiveness. We have approached our personnel problems by increasing the need for persons, particularly in the psychiatric area, completely in the wrong way. What we should do is try to analyze every transaction that goes on between ourselves and our time, try to understand why this transaction occurs, what is its purpose, what is it in the plan of the outcome of this program, what is it we are going to have to do to get this plan achieved?

When you get all these transactions enumerated, then you will have to gather them and say, "I wonder who can do these transactions." When you decide who can do these transactions, decide who they will be and what kind of person he will have to be in order to do them, you will come to an effective way of repairing the manpower situation. We just do not do this kind of study. We are in a helping situation about letting somebody else study it, and I suppose this is one of the reasons why medicine itself has been so ambivalent in letting social scientists come into medicine, because the social scientists, by definition, will be critics. That is to say, they will point out inefficiencies and may suggest different ways to organize the repair, helping, restorative systems. But the great change that occurs does not occur by these secondary teaching attempts, or by sensitivity training outside or in-service training inside. The great change in the organization is brought about by administrators who change the organization. That is to say, by supplemental changes in the organization itself. The administrator has great possibility when he goes in to manage an organization. He can either use the existing social structure, he can modify it, or he can create some new structures within. I submit to you that at this time we are going to have to decide some new functions for our existing organizations and we may have to have some new organizations. I think for our services now in behavior modification and control, we ought to get away from our system history, to see ourselves personally no longer as custodial subrogates but see to ourselves as treatment facilities, and to look forward to what people need in terms of the kind of behavior that will keep them adaptive.

This implies an understanding of the organization of the social processes of behavioral change with more knowledge and power with which to implement our efforts. We can change to real development institutions where people may come and they don't need to come to be entertained. They may come for an hour. It does not need to be one institution. It may be a collection of them, but the important thing is that the emphasis has to be on relearning, resocialization, new socialization, and development. This is not a therapeutic process, it is an educational process. It is a social dynamic process. It seems to me that we could modify Huxley's insistence that the managers are social scientists, but that the manager ought to be a developmental sociologist so that he can apply an understanding of how the whole system facilities will increase the development of persons.

Encouraging Children To Learn

Rudolf Dreikurs, M.D.

I am very pleased that I was invited to speak to this audience about encouragement. In my opinion and experience, the problem of encouragement is one of the most fundamental problems in our whole problem of education.

Why is encouragement so crucial? It can be well said that whatever you do to a person, particularly to a child, the significance of what you are doing to a large extent will depend upon whether we can encourage or discourage him. Many people who try to correct the child in the process discourage the child even further. One can actually come to the conclusion, watching what goes on, that people seem to be determined to discourage each other, almost as a necessity.

Why is this discouragement so dangerous, so fundamentally dangerous? A great deal has been written and said about what can be considered normal behavior. Many think it is normal to do what everyone else is doing. In every society different norms have developed, and whoever behaves in line with demands of society is normal. Average is normal, or normality is the absence of pathology. But what is pathological? Is conformity normal or abnormal? Then a great deal of discussion goes on, which, in my mind, misses the point.

It was one of the merits of Alfred Adler, my teacher, to have offered a clear-cut definition of normality which goes beyond the norms established by society. It is not true that society is the largest predominate factor that is normal because society, as such, can be abnormal, too. Adler found that we can behave normally and fulfill ourselves only when we act on the basis of a feeling of belonging.

Adler used the German term *gemeinschaftsgefühl,* a feeling of belonging, very poorly translated into social interest. Only where you feel that you belong as an equal, where you are sure of your place, only there do you function in a normal way in line with the needs of the situation.

It seems that in our culture we almost systematically deprive each other of this feeling of being good enough. Everyone strives to have a place for himself through education. He never realizes that he never will feel belonging as he strives to be someone. The more he strives to be somebody the less secure he can be. Why? If one does not realize that one belongs by one's very existence, what one will obtain will never be enough. And this is pathological for our society. Nobody is good enough, as is. We deprive our children in this competitive strife of the realization that they have a place by their mere existence. We drive them out to be more and more, and for every single child who becomes more academically and socially, there are hundreds and hundreds who fall by the wayside and never really believe they are good enough.

This doubt in one's value diminishes our ability to participate fully in a give-and-take kind of social event.

Our children, like any social beings, want to belong, and as long as the child is not discouraged, he will try to belong by doing what he knows should be done. When the child is discouraged, he switches to the useless side. Thus we find ourselves today in a most unusual pathological situation where hardly any child functions in a normal way. For instance, the term "brotherly love" was once a symbol of greatest devotion. Today you wouldn't wish your worst enemy to be treated as brothers treat brothers.

We take it for granted that people have to fight for a piece of status which cannot be obtained. We are living in a most pathological condition and most people don't know about it. There was never any living soul on this earth who didn't know what to do with his young, except our parents. It has gone so far that misbehavior and misfunction in children has become a norm.

Qualasios, who is well known on juvenile delinquency, created an important term. He

of your place, only there do you function in a normal way in line with the needs of the situation.

It seems that in our culture we almost systematically deprive each other of this feeling of being good enough. Everyone strives to have a place for himself through education. He never realizes that he never will feel belonging as he strives to be someone. The more he strives to be somebody the less secure he can be. Why? If one does not realize that one belongs by one's very existence, what one will obtain will never be enough. And this is pathological for our society. Nobody is good enough, as is. We deprive our children in this competitive strife of the realization that they have a place by their mere existence. We drive them out to be more and more, and for every single child who becomes more academically and socially, there are hundreds and hundreds who fall by the wayside and never really believe they are good enough.

This doubt in one's value diminishes our ability to participate fully in a give-and-take kind of social event.

Our children, like any social beings, want to belong, and as long as the child is not discouraged, he will try to belong by doing what he knows should be done. When the child is discouraged, he switches to the useless side. Thus we find ourselves today in a most unusual pathological situation where hardly any child functions in a normal way. For instance, the term "brotherly love" was once a symbol of greatest devotion. Today you wouldn't wish your worst enemy to be treated as brothers treat brothers.

We take it for granted that people have to fight for a piece of status which cannot be obtained. We are living in a most pathological condition and most people don't know about it. There was never any living soul on this earth who didn't know what to do with his young, except our parents. It has gone so far that misbehavior and misfunction in children has become a norm.

Qualasios, who is well known on juvenile delinquency, created an important term. He speaks about a continuum of norm violating behavior of our children. One angle is the continuum of the child who can't get up in the morning, who can't go to bed at night, who eats too much or eats too little, and fights with his brothers and sisters. To make him do any useful contribution around the house, in other words, to make him become the average American child is our task.

At the other end of the continuum is the juvenile delinquent. There is no qualitative difference between them, only a quantitative difference of rebellion. There is a war going on between adults and children, and most people don't know it. The only person of any significance who realized that besides ourselves was Maria Montessori.

Shortly before her death in India, she published in the *Montessori Magazine* a touching appeal for disarmament in education. She spoke about the war which takes place in every family and in every schoolroom. Why is it? What happened that you became unable to do something that everybody else in the history of mankind knew how to do. You see, raising children was based on tradition. One learned it from one generation to the other. There was no need for books, study groups, lectures, and so on.

In "South Sea Islands," Margaret Mead described a number of primitive societies, each of which raises children a different way and all have different personality types. But in each one of these tribes, children are raised in the same way and have been for hundreds of generations.

Our dilemma is that the traditional method of raising children is obsolete. Only in the last few decades, we in America obtained a degree of equality unheard of in the history of mankind. This equality is little understood. People have to learn to live with each other as equals. We don't realize what the basis of equality is.

It is the unwillingness to submit to dictation, and the war is still going on leading to a civil war in the United States between all these groups because none are willing to submit. Women no longer submit to the dictates of men. Labor fights against the dictation of management.

Negros fight against white supremacy. Children fight against authority of adults, and the war is on.

We need the change in our families. Otherwise, parents simply don't know what to do with the children and in this mutual warfare which goes on, everybody becomes discouraged. The vast majority of all our families begin each new day with a fight. And the parents get discouraged. We are living a life of frightened people. We are pessimistic. We don't believe in our ability, we don't believe in our parents, we don't believe in children, simply because we have not learned how to live with each other as equals, nor how to consider each other as equals. This has a tremendous influence on the behavior of our children.

We can safely say, as long as a child is not discouraged, he is willing to do what he is supposed to do. It is not only the question of being willing to learn, willing to participate, willing to do all the things which one can expect from a child, the child should know exactly what he is to do. But when he is discouraged, he switches to the useless side, and so we find this continuum of violating behavior as an expression of children who have the wrong idea of how they can belong.

There are four goals of misbehaving children. You must keep in mind that all behavior is purposeful. Behavior indicates the way one tries to find a place in the community. The four goals of disturbing behavior express a mistaken ideal on the part of the child for the conditions which makes him feel he can belong.

The first goal is demand for attention. He likes to get the attention in a pleasant way if he can, but if he doesn't get the attention in a pleasant way, he doesn't mind to disturb. He prefers being scolded, frightened, and punished, than being ignored. When he is ignored, he feels lost. So the fight begins.

Now, we parents and teachers try to tell the child, "Stop annoying us. Do the things you have to do," and the fight is on. When the fight becomes more intense, the child moves to goal No. 2, which is power.

He will openly tell you, "If you don't let me do what I want, you don't love me." The child feels entitled to do what he pleases, what he likes. In our homes and in our schools, particularly in the metropolitan areas, we are raising an increasing number of tyrants, children who dominate the family. Parents and teachers are not prepared to deal with this. They don't know what to do. When the fight becomes more intense, the child no longer wants attention or power. He can feel significant only if he can hurt an adult as much as he can hurt them. The most vicious of children are those who feel significant in revenge, goal No. 3.

Then we found goal No. 4, children who feel so discouraged, they want to be left alone. The sad part is that parents and teachers are not trained in understanding the goals of the child and therefore fall for it. Here is the tragedy: traditionally, such conflicts cannot exist. In an autocratic society, you had the power to beat them down, and there were authorities supported by society. Today, it doesn't go any more. Today, when you fight with the child, you are lost. The child is a much better fighter. Today, the child is not willing to give in, and as a consequence, we find that the children manipulate the adults, parents and teachers alike.

The parents and teachers who don't know the goals of the child reinforce the goal, doing exactly what the child wants them to do. We have to train parents and teachers to withdraw from the manipulations of the children. They can't, because they feel they are obliged to subdue the child. They have not the slightest awareness of the fact that revolt and punishment, and particularly punishment, is only effective and necessary in an autocratic society.

The only children who respond to punishment are those who don't need it. They are the ones who, once punished, remember it the rest of their lives.

There are others whom you want to impress, so you keep on punishing them with very temporary results. But what is much worse, when you punish a child today, the child in his realization of his equality feels that he has the same right to punish you. These acts of mutual re-

do what I want, you don't love me." The child feels entitled to do what he pleases, what he likes. In our homes and in our schools, particularly in the metropolitan areas, we are raising an increasing number of tyrants, children who dominate the family. Parents and teachers are not prepared to deal with this. They don't know what to do. When the fight becomes more intense, the child no longer wants attention or power. He can feel significant only if he can hurt an adult as much as he can hurt them. The most vicious of children are those who feel significant in revenge, goal No. 3.

Then we found goal No. 4, children who feel so discouraged, they want to be left alone. The sad part is that parents and teachers are not trained in understanding the goals of the child and therefore fall for it. Here is the tragedy: traditionally, such conflicts cannot exist. In an autocratic society, you had the power to beat them down, and there were authorities supported by society. Today, it doesn't go any more. Today, when you fight with the child, you are lost. The child is a much better fighter. Today, the child is not willing to give in, and as a consequence, we find that the children manipulate the adults, parents and teachers alike.

The parents and teachers who don't know the goals of the child reinforce the goal, doing exactly what the child wants them to do. We have to train parents and teachers to withdraw from the manipulations of the children. They can't, because they feel they are obliged to subdue the child. They have not the slightest awareness of the fact that revolt and punishment, and particularly punishment, is only effective and necessary in an autocratic society.

The only children who respond to punishment are those who don't need it. They are the ones who, once punished, remember it the rest of their lives.

There are others whom you want to impress, so you keep on punishing them with very temporary results. But what is much worse, when you punish a child today, the child in his realization of his equality feels that he has the same right to punish you. These acts of mutual retaliation fill our homes and our classrooms. We need completely new ways of stimulating children from within.

One of the first necessary methods is the process of encouragement.

One can well say, if an adult doesn't know how to encourage, he cannot stimulate in movement and function. We are interested in motivation modification, in having the children get away from the demand of attention and power.

One of the most effective ways of training adults to be wise to their children is by watching for the adult's emotional, impulsive reaction to what the child is doing. When you are annoyed by the child, you can be pretty sure the child wanted attention. When you feel defeated, the child wanted to show his power. When you feel hurt, you only oblige the child who wanted you to feel hurt. When you feel like throwing up your hands and saying, "I don't know what to do with you," you do exactly what the child wants, "Leave me alone, you can't do anything to me."

Unless we learn the stimulations from within, we have no influence on our children. We have to learn to see the tremendous capacity of children which we presently don't realize. We are a generation of frightened people in our personal lives and particularly in our relationships of mutual respect. We haven't learned to do this, therefore, we have broken marriages, labor strife, and racial strife, all because we haven't learned to live with each other as equals.

Now, the first thing which we probably have to do is to develop a new picture of children. Our picture is completely mistaken and is tied in with our mistaken concept of human being.

In this century, only two of the most important discoveries were made which will change mankind in the immediate future. Both were made at the same time and on a similar basis.

The first discovery was nuclear energy. Until recently the atom was the smallest, insignificant thing, and suddenly, we discover the tremendous power in this little atom.

The other discovery is the discovery about the power of man. Until recently, man was consid-

ered insignificant, like a kernel of sand on the beach. And suddenly, we realize this tremendous power that we all have without knowing it. Our estimate is that we probably operate under only 16% of our potential. We have no idea about the power which we have.

We admire nature's power, the huge waterfall, snow-capped mountains, a raging thunderstorm. They are all of nature, but no one is all of nature in himself. We are the computer for our brains, the only computer which is entirely constructed for ignorant people.

We need a completely new idea of what our children are like. One of my favorite examples is the following:

Have you ever seen an infant born to deaf parents? It is a weird picture. If such an infant of six months cries, the tears stream down his cheeks, the face is in grimaces, the whole body shakes, but not one peep comes out of his mouth. Why? Because the child found out that it doesn't do any good, and no child will continue anything which doesn't get him what he wants.

I became interested in the question: At what age does an infant of deaf parents realize that the sound doesn't do any good? Students who work with these infants told me that it takes a normal infant one to two months to find out that the noise doesn't do any good. When the children get older and lose their temper, they stamp their feet because that is the only way to make the parents realize that they have a temper.

Everything that goes on in our families is well designed by the children, but they have no idea of the cause. The child doesn't know why he does something. We have to help him understand it, and we have found a very definite way we can confront children with their goals. If you want to find out how to do it, you have to acquaint yourself with this technique.

You first ask the child, "Why do you do that? Why don't you study? Why do you misbehave?" The child doesn't know it and we know that he doesn't know it, but that his answer will be either, "I don't know," or some kind of rationalization.

After we hear what he says, we say, "Would you mind if I tell you what I think, why I think

Harold J. Bowers and Rudolf Dreikurs

age does an infant of deaf parents realize that the sound doesn't do any good? Students who work with these infants told me that it takes a normal infant one to two months to find out that the noise doesn't do any good. When the children get older and lose their temper, they stamp their feet because that is the only way to make the parents realize that they have a temper.

Everything that goes on in our families is well designed by the children, but they have no idea of the cause. The child doesn't know why he does something. We have to help him understand it, and we have found a very definite way we can confront children with their goals. If you want to find out how to do it, you have to acquaint yourself with this technique.

You first ask the child, "Why do you do that? Why don't you study? Why do you misbehave?" The child doesn't know it and we know that he doesn't know it, but that his answer will be either, "I don't know," or some kind of rationalization.

After we hear what he says, we say, "Would you mind if I tell you what I think, why I think you are doing this?" In most cases the children don't mind.

s and Rudolf Dreikurs

In this way, you are preparing him for the confrontation which always has to be in an indirect way. You don't throw the explanation of the goal at the child, you suggest it. "Could it be you want to keep mother-teacher busy?" or "Do you want to show that they can't make you or can't stop you?" "You want to show them that you can hurt them, get even with them?" "You want to be left alone?"

This is the most powerful means to make a child aware of his goals. Actually, people can't understand why children respond to explanations which are unpleasant in such a positive way.

You must keep in mind that helping the child understand the purpose of his misbehavior is one of the most encouraging experiences you can provide for him. Why? The child, usually, when he misbehaves, says, "I know I am lazy. I am a bad boy." He is critical of himself. He knows he is not doing well, but what can he do about it? Telling him he is aggressive, a dreamer, or lazy will not help.

The child becomes aware of his power to decide when you point out to him, "You want to keep mother busy," or, "You want to defeat your teacher." In this realization, life holds the possibility of an alternative. He can suddenly realize, "I don't have to continue it."

For the first time the child becomes aware of the tremendous power he has to manipulate adults. And without fighting him, one can recognize the power. One of the first things in that power conflict is to admit you are stronger. The teacher and parents get much more prestige and status by saying, "You are much too clever for me." You defeat all he is doing when you don't fight with him.

We have to work on this whole question of relationship – how we treat children and how we treat adults. Part of this is gaining of mutual encouragement. At a summer workshop at the University of Delaware, I asked the teachers, "What do you expect to get out of this course?" Their answer: "What to do with the child who

doesn't behave." That same day I asked a group of children, "What would you like to discuss?" The answer was: "What to do with the teacher who gives us a bit of work, but never keeps any kind of an agreement, who always makes his own decisions?" The same story on both sides.

Two of these boys complained about the teacher who was very boring. You must keep in mind the change in the relationship between teacher and children. It was simple at one time – the teacher had to study to teach, and the children had to learn. But it doesn't go any more. When the teachers are boring, the children refuse to learn.

I asked them, "Can't you perhaps talk with the teacher? Perhaps he doesn't know what he does or how you feel about it."

"He won't listen, or he might get angry."

"It depends how you do it," I said. You might do it in a nice form, or you can ask him if he would be willing to listen to what you have to say."

They don't want to do it.

"But don't you want to help your teacher?" I asked.

"He is not our friend," they answer.

They are willing to fight it out every day, but not to help each other.

The first thing is to extricate ourselves from the fights. The disturbed relationship is the reason why the children don't behave and don't function. Correcting the child will make the relationship worse. We operate under strange principles. The less the child wants to learn, the more unpleasant we make it for him.

Many teachers send love letters home. These tell the parents that the child doesn't study, doesn't take care of his belongings, is a day dreamer, or whatever else he is. Why do teachers send the love letters home? They seem so defeated by the child in their classroom that they want to mess it up for them in their home.

We have to learn to come to cooperation. One of the main things is discussion. The family cannot operate autocratically any more, therefore, the family becomes permissive. We must have participation and decision-making on the part of the family, children, and school.

In the family, we need the family council where children participate in discussions of the problem. We need, in the classrooms, group discussion where we list the first things when we begin to listen to each other. In our society nobody listens. As soon as somebody says something, you don't agree. You begin to argue. The same with our families, and you find it is the same in a school. There is no sense to talk at the moment of conflicts because in the conflict situation, nobody listens. Before you talk with the child, you have to make sure he wants to listen which eliminates 75% of all talk in the family. You only talk when something is wrong.

As long as you criticize, as long as you blame, you undermine self-confidence and self-respect. You have to get together to talk things over. This is part of the revolution going on throughout the whole world today. Out of this, we are having a democratic revolution.

This revolution has been compared with the revolution of 1848 in Europe where, from one country to the other, the revolution broke loose. At that time, people were fighting for their political freedom. The revolutions which we have are revolutions for participation and decision-making, but it has to be done in the family.

In the school, the teacher suffers for the same mistaken ideal. I raise the question: How much should one be permissive? How much should one be strict? When I'm asked, I always say, "What is better, to be hanged or to be shot?" When you are punitive, you get rebellion; when you are permissive, you get anarchy.

When the teacher decides what to do, she is an autocrat. If she lets the children decide, she has anarchy. We all have to participate in decisions.

Our universities are the victim of an autocratic, undemocratic organization. The president decides what to do with the rebels, and the rebels demand what they should do. They don't have a governing body composed of the representative of trustees. They are participating in what should be done. We have to have this democratic participation in our home, school,

In the family, we need the family council where children participate in discussions of the problem. We need, in the classrooms, group discussion where we list the first things when we begin to listen to each other. In our society nobody listens. As soon as somebody says something, you don't agree. You begin to argue. The same with our families, and you find it is the same in a school. There is no sense to talk at the moment of conflicts because in the conflict situation, nobody listens. Before you talk with the child, you have to make sure he wants to listen which eliminates 75% of all talk in the family. You only talk when something is wrong.

As long as you criticize, as long as you blame, you undermine self-confidence and self-respect. You have to get together to talk things over. This is part of the revolution going on throughout the whole world today. Out of this, we are having a democratic revolution.

This revolution has been compared with the revolution of 1848 in Europe where, from one country to the other, the revolution broke loose. At that time, people were fighting for their political freedom. The revolutions which we have are revolutions for participation and decision-making, but it has to be done in the family.

In the school, the teacher suffers for the same mistaken ideal. I raise the question: How much should one be permissive? How much should one be strict? When I'm asked, I always say, "What is better, to be hanged or to be shot?" When you are punitive, you get rebellion; when you are permissive, you get anarchy.

When the teacher decides what to do, she is an autocrat. If she lets the children decide, she has anarchy. We all have to participate in decisions.

Our universities are the victim of an autocratic, undemocratic organization. The president decides what to do with the rebels, and the rebels demand what they should do. They don't have a governing body composed of the representative of trustees. They are participating in what should be done. We have to have this democratic participation in our home, school, community, and industry. Everywhere. We can train parents to be democratic leaders, where they neither fight nor give in, but help to promote what is good for all. We can train the teachers to be democratic leaders.

Even those children who do study do it for completely the wrong reason, not because they enjoy it, but because they want to feel superior.

They go to high school in order to get good grades so they may go to college. Why do they go to college? Because they want to get a degree in order to make more money. The universities are just as bankrupt as our schools, because there is very little comparison between the competition and the degree. We don't train counselors or teachers merely to stimulate, we train them to pass degrees. We have to get out of this whole atmosphere of fighting with each other, of punishing each other in this competitive strife. We have to train parents and teachers in the art of encouragement, which presupposes losing this fear, this pessimism, a change of relationship.

Now comes the strange thing. The process of encouragement is extremely complex and one has to learn this art. In the last analysis, whether you encourage a child or not depends entirely on him. I'll give you an example: A child is convinced he is stupid. He can't learn. The teacher is equally convinced that he is not stupid. If the teacher tries to tell the child he is not stupid and the child tries to tell him that he is, who wins out? Always the child.

What is threatening and what is supportive? Supportive is everything which agrees with what the person says. Threatening is everything which disagrees. This puts a peculiar light on the process of supportive therapy. When you tell a person, "I am sure you can't do it," when he is convinced he can't, this is threatening. If you tell a child who says he is stupid, he is not, he won't buy it. It is discouraging to him. First, you have to find out how he came to the conclusion, then show him how to get out of it.

In the last analysis, it depends on the person, and I will give you an example to show you the complexities.

Freda Von Reichman is a famous psychologist in a famous mental hospital. She once presented to the Mayo Psychiatric Association, the following example:

She had a heavy day at the office and as she tried to close the office, a young girl came, a schizophrenic girl. I don't know what the girl did or what she said, but Freda Von Reichman lost her temper.

Freda was very upset. She had never treated anybody like that, especially not a schizophrenic girl who is not responsible and has a weak ego. She spent a sleepless night feeling so bad because she became impatient with the girl.

The next morning, when she went to the office, Freda found a letter from this girl thanking her profusely for what she had done. She said, "It was the first time in a long time that somebody treated me like a normal human being."

Keep that in mind when you are confronted with the problems in the hospital or in the school.

We treat people with kid gloves on one side and then with a stick in the other hand, when we should treat them like normal human beings, and talk with them as we would with normal human beings. Even psychotic patients are only irrational as long as you fail to understand their private logic. When you understand their private logic, you can talk with them.

So we have to come to the conclusion that the process of encouragement is very complex. One has to devote time to it. Learn how to reach the individual, how to instill in him the realization of his worth, his respect for his own ability, even though he may use his abilities in a destructive way.

I am convinced that we have underrated the intellectual capacity of our young children. I am convinced that within the first ten years of their lives, all our children can learn what our college graduates know today.

Why do our children have reading readiness at the age of six? Because it is anticipated, demanded of them. Some children decide to learn earlier, and some children decide to learn later.

We are now finding that about the right time to teach children to read and write is between two-and-a-half and three years of age. The later we start, the more difficult it is because the child has settled down with the idea that he can't do it.

We have to tap these resources. Our revolution in the learning field will come when we catch up on the way little children learn before they go to school, and how little they learn after.

With all these, we have a question of the status of punishment, success and failure. The little children learn without this concern. They enjoy learning. We know how to promote enjoyment of learning, but we don't practice it.

It will take considerable change in our human relationship, in our competitive strife, before we will actually be able to promote in all our children this enjoyment of learning, the enjoyment of being useful, and the enjoyment of doing the right things. We have to stop doing what we are doing and that requires some kind of work.

Innovations In Residential Care For The Handicapped

Gerald R. Clark, M.D.

I would like to talk about attitudinal barriers toward retardation and about their history. We owe a great debt to Professor Itard because many of the innovations in working with the retarded were borrowed from him. Dr. Seguin borrowed from him; Montessori borrowed from Seguin. The first programs for the retarded began in the 1850's. The Elwyn Institute was started about that time and was called the Pennsylvania Training School for Feeble-Minded and Idiotic Children, with a great big sign out in front with that full title on it.

Back in the mid-1800's, they thought feeble mindedness could be cured. The quality of care, the programs in vocational training, the humanitarian attitude, and the level of quality of many of the institutions in this country were superior to many private and state institutions today.

I think what happens in institutions is a reflection of the attitudes of the community. About the turn of the century, people became concerned about the dangers of inheriting feeblemindedness and a process of degradation associated with that. The institutions became crowded with the severe and profoundly retarded. It was thought that sterilization, segregation and separation from the community were the things indicated, and most of our state institutions built around the turn of the century were placed far out in the country or were spread out so that no one area of the state was left out.

We began to get a little science in this field when Dr. Benet developed a test in 1905 for the placing of students in Paris schools. However, it was used for other things, and I think it has been greatly misused. In 1922 Dr. Terman at Stanford University wrote a book called the *Measurement of Intelligence* in which he said those individuals with an IQ score of 70 or below should be classified as feeble-minded, those with IQ's between 70 and 50 should be called morons, those with an IQ of 50 to 20, imbeciles, and those with an IQ of 20 or below, idiots. To a large extent, this was pretty much accepted without much discussion and commonly used as a basis for admission of children and adults to state hospitals or special classes in the public school system. The educators, of course, changed the term "moron" to "educable", and the term "imbecile" to "trainable."

In those days crime and feeble-mindedness were linked together. It is hard to realize that only 50 or 60 years ago it was thought that people committed crimes or robberies because they were feeble-minded. They actually used this IQ test to test prisoners before World War I, and according to the test, surely they seemed feeble-minded.

During World War I they used the test to test officers and men, and to their surprise they found that about a quarter to a third of them were retarded. Since people were patriotic even in those days, they changed the test. After that when they tested the prisoners, they found that there was no appreciable difference between the IQ of the prisoners and the general public. Many people have this old attitude that lingers on.

A little more tolerance for the retarded developed after some of the studies on the Jukes and the Kallikaks were re-evaluated – and some of the conclusions were discredited.

The first institution for the retarded was started in Massachusetts in 1848 by a Dr. Samuel Howell and later was named the Dr. Walter E. Fernald State School and Hospital. A strong-minded individual, Dr. Fernald made a study after World War I of crime and social chaos problems created in the community by patients who had escaped from the school or were reluctantly released after advice to the families. To his amazement he found that he was wrong. Instead of being involved in crime and prostitution, the majority of them were working and making a good adjustment. His study was duplicated in other places in New York State, the findings gradually leading to a period of more tolerance.

should be classified as feeble-minded, those with IQ's between 70 and 50 should be called morons, those with an IQ of 50 to 20, imbeciles, and those with an IQ of 20 or below, idiots. To a large extent, this was pretty much accepted without much discussion and commonly used as a basis for admission of children and adults to state hospitals or special classes in the public school system. The educators, of course, changed the term "moron" to "educable", and the term "imbecile" to "trainable."

In those days crime and feeble-mindedness were linked together. It is hard to realize that only 50 or 60 years ago it was thought that people committed crimes or robberies because they were feeble-minded. They actually used this IQ test to test prisoners before World War I, and according to the test, surely they seemed feeble-minded.

During World War I they used the test to test officers and men, and to their surprise they found that about a quarter to a third of them were retarded. Since people were patriotic even in those days, they changed the test. After that when they tested the prisoners, they found that there was no appreciable difference between the IQ of the prisoners and the general public. Many people have this old attitude that lingers on.

A little more tolerance for the retarded developed after some of the studies on the Jukes and the Kallikaks were re-evaluated – and some of the conclusions were discredited.

The first institution for the retarded was started in Massachusetts in 1848 by a Dr. Samuel Howell and later was named the Dr. Walter E. Fernald State School and Hospital. A strong-minded individual, Dr. Fernald made a study after World War I of crime and social chaos problems created in the community by patients who had escaped from the school or were reluctantly released after advice to the families. To his amazement he found that he was wrong. Instead of being involved in crime and prostitution, the majority of them were working and making a good adjustment. His study was duplicated in other places in New York State, the findings gradually leading to a period of more tolerance.

It was only during World War II with the shortage of labor that it was recognized that the handicapped could be trained and made good workers. With the development of the National Association for Retarded Children in 1950, some of the stigma was eased, but much hangs on, and probably is increasing in some ways. Although the terms "moron," "imbecile," and "idiot" were well accepted years ago, now they seem to have a very unpleasant connotation. I think that mental retardation will somewhere along the line have to stop using them and come up with some new terms. Too long have we emphasized the negative. It is time to accentuate the positive. We should talk in terms of mental growth, rather than the negative.

Changes at Elwyn

I would like to come back to some of my personal experiences at Elwyn, because in a sense it is like many public and private institutions in the country today. Less than ten years ago, Elwyn was a locked, custodial institution. The buildings were obsolete; they hadn't been painted for 30-40 years; the grounds were littered with trash; open incinerators were used. The inmates – I call them inmates deliberately, because that is what they were – had less freedom than prisoners in a penitentiary. I think I can say that there wasn't any institution in the United States that was any worse than Elwyn. The inmates were classified as morons, imbeciles and idiots, and these terms were used in dis-[redacted]ng the individual or the child with the [redacted]. All were called children regardless of [redacted] they were considered incapable of doing anything, and this was structured so as to reinforce their dependence and their lack of ability. Despite that, many of them worked 60 to 80 hours a week in a laundry or in a power plant or in the dietary department. At that time there were only 265 employees for over 1,050 residents. There was little or no professional staff. There were no social workers. There was one psychologist with a Master's degree and one physician licensed to practice medicine in the state. There was no training program.

There was a small education program for less than 100 children, very academically oriented and not in any way oriented toward helping the individual adjust personally or in the community. It was controlled by physical punishment – ridicule, Iroquois haircuts, benching, solitary confinement for periods up to seven or eight weeks. I don't think the situation was much worse than that in many institutions at that time. All mail was censored, no phone calls were permitted. Inmates were not permitted to go home for holidays or vacations. At the time, the institution was running at a yearly deficit of $150,000 to $200,000.

About 80% of the residents were state-supported, although Elywn is a non-profit, private institution. The improvements that we have made are the result primarily of changes in attitude and method of operation and not primarily by virtue of increased support. Even today the institution functions at a per capita which is about $2,000 to $4,000 a year less than the state schools and institutions in Pennsylvania.

After it was decided to make some changes, one of the first things which we did was to sit around a table. It was the first time that many of the program people had met as a group in years. We talked about some of the things that should be done, some of the things that we could do, because there was no new special staff, just the employees who had been there. As we talked, it came out that the north fire escapes were locked, and these are multi-storied, wood floor buildings. The doors to the day rooms in the dormitories were locked and seclusion rooms inside the dormitories were locked. There were times when there wasn't an employee on the floor with a key. There had been no fire and safety drills since World War II because it was felt that this would prompt the children to set fires. Some employees were concerned about this, and some thought with the limited staff this was the only way to control the situation.

As we talked about the situation there seemed to be a little gain in those who felt that something should be done. So, I said, at that point, "It seems as though the majority is in favor of making a change. If you will hold the for just a minute, I'll ask the maintenan to take the cores out of the locks to ev mitory and every day room in the ins This is exactly what I did.

I knew from experience that employe continue to lock the doors if the cores in from their own insecurity, their own habit. We went that afternoon, wit preparation whatsoever, or any prior from a completely custodial institution t which the doors to every dormitory room for over 1,000 individuals were and have been unlocked since. Many employees felt there would be mass ru boy and girl escapades and difficultie didn't realize that to the residents it me the staff was placing some degree of co and trust in them, and the residents reac positively. Our runaways went down that, because there was no need to rebe away. I don't know of any incident behavior of any individual who left his in the weeks immediately following.

The important thing, of course, was no the locks off. The important thing was employees could no longer regard the as animals to be locked up and den respect and dignity and rights of a citize had to kind of look at them a little dif We also changed the term "children" to s We didn't use "patients" because the wo notes a medical condition. There was so positive about "student." It was akin brothers and sisters at school, and it em education and training and rehabilitati possible return to the community.

We changed the title "matron" to mother," a much warmer term which c an entirely different relationship. The att became "counselors." It took the empha looking after the quarters or making i seeing that control is maintained, to a of working with and counseling with t dents. It is also a kind of ambiguous term allows the employees to have some small of pride and prestige in what is a compa menial position. It is also a factor in he

making a change. If you will hold the meeting for just a minute, I'll ask the maintenance force to take the cores out of the locks to every dormitory and every day room in the institution." This is exactly what I did.

I knew from experience that employees would continue to lock the doors if the cores were left in from their own insecurity, their own force of habit. We went that afternoon, without any preparation whatsoever, or any prior thought, from a completely custodial institution to one in which the doors to every dormitory and day room for over 1,000 individuals were unlocked and have been unlocked since. Many of the employees felt there would be mass runaways, boy and girl escapades and difficulties. They didn't realize that to the residents it meant that the staff was placing some degree of confidence and trust in them, and the residents reacted very positively. Our runaways went down just like that, because there was no need to rebel, to run away. I don't know of any incident of misbehavior of any individual who left his building in the weeks immediately following.

The important thing, of course, was not taking the locks off. The important thing was that the employees could no longer regard the inmates as animals to be locked up and denied the respect and dignity and rights of a citizen. They had to kind of look at them a little differently. We also changed the term "children" to students. We didn't use "patients" because the word connotes a medical condition. There was something positive about "student." It was akin to their brothers and sisters at school, and it emphasizes education and training and rehabilitation, and possible return to the community.

We changed the title "matron" to "housemother," a much warmer term which connotes an entirely different relationship. The attendants became "counselors." It took the emphasis from looking after the quarters or making beds, or seeing that control is maintained, to a concept of working with and counseling with the residents. It is also a kind of ambiguous term which allows the employees to have some small degree of pride and prestige in what is a comparatively menial position. It is also a factor in helping to recruit and train individuals. It is particularly difficult, as you know, to get men to work in residential institutions. It is much easier to get women. For some of our programs we felt that we ought to recruit men.

We have emphasized that everyone employed at the institution is a member of the treatment team. It doesn't matter whether the employee is a janitor, a plumber, a secretary, a physician, a psychiatrist, or a vocational counselor. If you are going to gain their support and their morale and if they are going to interact with other individuals and with the student, I think there is a great deal to gain from this concept.

There is always a great deal of controversy about the qualifications for the head of an institution. I don't think there is any profession or group that has any divine prerogative for this. I think you have to look for an individual who has administrative ability and knows how to get people to work together effectively, and who can show professional leadership. From that standpoint, it doesn't matter what the individual's background is, if he has those characteristics. So we tell the new employee when he is first hired as a counselor that there is nothing to stop him from going all the way up to the top, even to becoming the president.

I believe this very firmly. At Elwyn one of the most capable individuals we have is a high school graduate. Ten years ago he was working as a clerk in the business office. He is the most valuable man in the entire institution, because of the personal qualities he has, his administrative abilities, and his ability to give leadership. At one time or another he has headed up finance administration, the personnel office and residential programs. I only regret that he isn't twins.

Nowadays you hear a great deal about facilities – residential facilities and community facilities – and I think it is wrong. I think we should be talking about program. Standards for facilities are fine, but far more important are standards for program.

The Elwyn Program

We started a contract workshop, the first one to be established in an institutional setting in a

mental retardation facility. It was a terrific success. Residents got a charge from seeing what they could do in comparison with the fellow sitting next to them, and compared to what they did last week. The little money earned meant a great deal. Our workshop program expanded and at the present time we have 250 individuals employed full-time, eight hours a day, five days a week. It is just one step in a broad range of programs, but it is a good step on which to begin, perhaps a step above arts and crafts or occupational therapy. For many individuals who have been in the back wards or institutionalized for years, it's the place where you can begin to motivate.

We had one young lady who was described as severely retarded and was so feeble she had to be helped to the contract workshop. She was 96 years of age. After about a week or ten days she was so enthused about what she was doing in the workshop that she could make it over a couple of hundred yards to the building under her own steam. She worked in that contract workshop until she was 98 when additional physical infirmities meant that she had to stop. Here was an individual described in the charts as severely retarded, needing lifelong custodial care. About a year and a half ago she celebrated her 100th birthday. I said, "Carrie, what do you want for your birthday?" She said, "I would like some ice cream, and I would like to watch the late shows on TV." I said, "Is there anything else, Carrie?" She said, "I would like to go to Atlantic City." I said, "Why would you like to go to Atlantic City?" She said, "I would like to go on the Boardwalk and maybe wade in the ocean."

Now I ask you, do you feel that this woman at 100 years of age, with these concepts, is severely retarded, and that she had to spend 87 years in an institution? I don't. It shows what we have done by our attitudes, our feeling that she was incapable. I haven't the slightest doubt that given the opportunity for proper education and social adjustment in a few years she could have been returned to the community 85 years ago, and probably would have had great-great grandchildren by now and I'm sure that they would be normal.

We developed a work-study program, half a day of academic program, half a day of vocational training, for teenagers. We went a step farther and decided we would accept individuals from the community. We had some reservation about how the day students would mix with the residential students; these programs are also coeducational, boys and girls. There was very little, if any, problem, and it seemed to benefit both the day students and the residential students. The day students were the potential high school dropouts in the public and parochial schools. It started small with about 16 or 20 the first year; today we have about 150 potential high school dropouts transported in from 29 school districts in the area.

When this group first comes to Elywn, the students enter a classroom which doesn't look like a classroom . . . no desks, no chairs, no books. They are a little at a loss as to what to make out of this situation and of course these individuals who have chips on their shoulders are hostile. The instructor asks them, "Well, what did you expect? What do you want? What do you expect to get out of a program? What do you think should be done?" They become involved talking among themselves, just like group therapy, and without realizing it, after about two weeks they began to outline what they would like to learn. It changed their attitude completely. Now we have 200 or more in the work-study program. We have no problems with them, no vandalism, no fights. The only explanation I have is that somehow we reached them and got them interested in what they were doing. We have some very clever people on our staff who are able to do this.

We have been gradually building up a team of very competent people. We play down the disciplines. You have to be very careful of the hardening of the professional categories and development of little empires in psychology or social service, or medicine or education. We blur the professional distinctions as much as we can by having physicians working in the education training department, responsible to the

grandchildren by now and I'm sure that they would be normal.

We developed a work-study program, half a day of academic program, half a day of vocational training, for teenagers. We went a step farther and decided we would accept individuals from the community. We had some reservation about how the day students would mix with the residential students; these programs are also coeducational, boys and girls. There was very little, if any, problem, and it seemed to benefit both the day students and the residential students. The day students were the potential high school dropouts in the public and parochial schools. It started small with about 16 or 20 the first year; today we have about 150 potential high school dropouts transported in from 29 school districts in the area.

When this group first comes to Elywn, the students enter a classroom which doesn't look like a classroom . . . no desks, no chairs, no books. They are a little at a loss as to what to make out of this situation and of course these individuals who have chips on their shoulders are hostile. The instructor asks them, "Well, what did you expect? What do you want? What do you expect to get out of a program? What do you think should be done?" They become involved talking among themselves, just like group therapy, and without realizing it, after about two weeks they began to outline what they would like to learn. It changed their attitude completely. Now we have 200 or more in the work-study program. We have no problems with them, no vandalism, no fights. The only explanation I have is that somehow we reached them and got them interested in what they were doing. We have some very clever people on our staff who are able to do this.

We have been gradually building up a team of very competent people. We play down the disciplines. You have to be very careful of the hardening of the professional categories and development of little empires in psychology or social service, or medicine or education. We blur the professional distinctions as much as we can by having physicians working in the education training department, responsible to the psychologist in charge. We transfer them from time to time, too. Where we find that one group or individuals are beginning to feel that this is their prerogative, then we begin to bear down with them. We have a fundamental concept that regardless of how capable an individual is and how much ability he has, if he cannot function as a member of the team he is a liability, rather than an asset.

Although the contract workshop and the work-study program were good, we needed some realistic vocational training if we were to prepare the individual to go out and live in the community and support himself. Over a period of time we built up 19 specific trade courses and became a licensed trade school approved by the State Department of Education. We prepare for such occupations as dietary assistant, hospital aide, beautician's helper, barber's helper, and painter's helper. In business education we have such courses as typing, key punch operation, sewing machine operators, baker's assistant.

We then started working with some of the individuals who had been in the institution for years because they were orphans or abandoned. After a period of work training assignment and vocational trade, we asked them what they wanted to do, rather than telling them. In the community work program they have a full time job in the community and use a taxi or train to go back and forth to work. When they come back in the evening, we have group counseling with them. If they demonstrate that they can make a satisfactory adjustment, have over $500 in their savings account, take out health and hospitalization insurance, join social clubs and church, we will discharge them to themselves. We have discharged over 300. Their average period of hospitalization was about 20 years. One individual had been in the institution 46 years.

We found that with proper training if they lost a job they could find another on their own and they could hold a job even during times of general unemployment. The demand for them is quite good.

A number of these individuals had to come

back for a short period, but none of them had to return to an institution. All are in the community making a satisfactory adjustment and supporting themselves by work. It could cost society several hundred millions of dollars for this group alone if they were to have lifelong custodial care. In addition to the humanitarian aspects of it, we also have to be aware of the economic aspects. This is the thing that will make the public or the legislators pay attention.

We were fortunate enough to receive a grant for a follow-up study with this particular group. We followed up very closely how they were doing in the community. We wanted them to teach us what they needed to know, what skills were essential for making a satisfactory adjustment. With this feedback we began to program these skills into the total curriculum. Our curriculum is continually changing but we think is much more relevant to the individual. This means a great deal to the individual and it means a great deal to his parents. Essentially, we are trying to train them so that they can go out in the community and no longer be recognized as "mentally retarded."

We also began to specialize a little more in education. We believe in the principle of trying new things, pilot projects, to keep up discussion between the staff and to keep the staff on their toes. A pilot program has been established for pre-school children who will teach us. We have set up a program in special education with ungraded classes and licensed as Elwyn School. We set up a special program for brain-damaged children for a couple of reasons: we received a categorical grant, and we wanted to work with these children who were so severely impaired, immature, hyper-active, or emotionally disturbed that they couldn't be accepted in the classroom situation. We found that by working with them in small groups of four to seven over a period of a year or so many of these children improved enough to adjust in the classroom situation.

We have about 150 children in the Douglas T. Davidson Program for Brain Damaged Children at this time. They are bussed in from 29 school districts in the area and intermingled with the residential youngsters. In addition Langford School which is licensed f tionally and socially handicapped." cently we established programs for th tually handicapped who may or ma functioning on a mentally retarded le

We try to think in terms of the i child and his specific needs and to hav range of programs to meet these need less than enthusiastic about profession nosis and categories. I believe it is t hang-up we have in the whole field. tremendous injustice by labeling a c or that. We have reached the point w are not going to mention the term "m tardation" at all unless we are completin application and that is the only way w funds. I would like to get away from entirely and speak in terms of menta and development, accentuating the po

We try to create a situation in w child and his parents can have pride. A our students participate in graduation ies. Several years ago the students d wear caps and gowns and they made t It was an impressive ceremony. We g certificates of academic completion wh a great deal to these individuals.

We have also developed scouting and now Elwyn Institute apparently more scouting units than any other inst the world. We have 23 scouting units – Packs, 11 Scout Troups, five Explorer Girl Scout Troups. An occasional indi advanced to Eagle Scout.

We have so focused on the individua for verbal or written communication ignore all the other abilities – their e stability, their dexterity, their skills in m art – and we do them and ourselves a d We were slow to recognize the need for training, but we now have full-time throughout the year and advanced c think it is an advantage for an institutio a college affiliation to bring in some st and sophistication.

ne of them had to
in the community
nt and supporting
ost society several
r this group alone
custodial care. In
aspects of it, we
economic aspects.
e the public or the

to receive a grant
s particular group.
how they were
wanted them to
know, what skills
atisfactory adjust-
began to program
riculum. Our cur-
g but we think is
individual. This
idual and it means
ssentially, we are
hey can go out in
be recognized as

ze a little more in
principle of trying
keep up discussion
the staff on their
en established for
each us. We have
ducation with un-
as Elwyn School.
for brain-damaged
ons: we received a
nted to work with
severely impaired,
otionally disturbed
d in the classroom
working with them
en over a period of
children improved
sroom situation.

ren in the Douglas
ain Damaged Chil-
bussed in from 29
d intermingled with

the residential youngsters. In addition we have Langford School which is licensed for "emotionally and socially handicapped." More recently we established programs for the perceptually handicapped who may or may not be functioning on a mentally retarded level.

We try to think in terms of the individual child and his specific needs and to have a broad range of programs to meet these needs. I am less than enthusiastic about professional diagnosis and categories. I believe it is the worst hang-up we have in the whole field. We do a tremendous injustice by labeling a child this or that. We have reached the point where we are not going to mention the term "mental retardation" at all unless we are completing a grant application and that is the only way we can get funds. I would like to get away from the term entirely and speak in terms of mental growth and development, accentuating the positive.

We try to create a situation in which the child and his parents can have pride. At age 18 our students participate in graduation ceremonies. Several years ago the students decided to wear caps and gowns and they made their own. It was an impressive ceremony. We give them certificates of academic completion which mean a great deal to these individuals.

We have also developed scouting activities and now Elwyn Institute apparently sponsors more scouting units than any other institution in the world. We have 23 scouting units – two Cub Packs, 11 Scout Troups, five Explorer Posts, five Girl Scout Troups. An occasional individual is advanced to Eagle Scout.

We have so focused on the individual's ability for verbal or written communication that we ignore all the other abilities – their emotional stability, their dexterity, their skills in music and art – and we do them and ourselves a disservice. We were slow to recognize the need for inservice training, but we now have full-time programs throughout the year and advanced courses. I think it is an advantage for an institution to have a college affiliation to bring in some stimulation and sophistication.

Penn State University gives university courses at Elwyn, and we pay half the tuition for our staff. People from the community may also enroll. This winter there will be 12 different courses which an employee can take at Elwyn Institute.

We have sponsored workshops, featuring national experts in the field, to bring something dynamic and progressive into the environment. I think you have to do this if you are going to avoid the pitfall of lifelong custodial care.

Research can also play a role and we have been involved in research with chromosomes, with dentocronology (the study of tooth deformity), brain damage, and behavior modification.

These things are important, but you cannot put too much emphasis on them. The main thrust in this type of program has to be education and training and rehabilitation. University affiliation and research help, but they must be kept in their place. They are secondary. Medicine and psychiatry are supportive, but not the main thrust.

You have to be concerned about the principle of cost benefit. Psychiatrists have priced themselves out of range, and I'm not too sure that they are always effective in the settings in which we use them. Recently we have been employing psychiatric nurse therapists, and we have been very fortunate and have gotten some very competent individuals at a fraction of the cost of psychiatrists.

One of our problems is facilities. Our buildings, built about the turn of the century, are obsolete and not suitable for our type of programming. We came up with a new one recently and we now have 400 beds under construction. The rooms can be single or double-occupancy, with about 10 men sharing a bathroom, with plenty of showers and toilet facilities. However, I don't want to emphasize facilities. The main thrust is program.

In summary, Elwyn Institute was created in response to community needs and attempts to remain responsive to the many changes in an increasingly complex and complicated society.

To do this, Elwyn has established a broad range of services for the handicapped, emphasizing mental growth and human development. The speed of change in community needs and resources has been unsettling. Today's innovation can be tomorrow's standard procedure or an anachronism in the process of change and development. To cope we must constantly challenge the effectiveness of our policies and programs. We must be open-minded, willing to change, and constantly seeking more effective methods.

Colonel S. L. Stephan

Superintendent
Ohio Soldiers and Sailors Orphans Home
Xenia, Ohio

The Ohio Soldiers and Sailors Orphans Home, located in Greene County, is for the children of veterans of the State of Ohio. Our home is celebrating its centennial this year. It was started in 1869 by the Grand Army of the Republic. It became a state function in December of 1869 and has remained such during these hundred years. We are a state agency. Our Board of Trustees, appointed by the governor for five-year terms, has the responsibility for establishing policies in accordance with the state code for the operation of the home.

We operate a school system, grades one through twelve, having both an academic department and a vocational department. Under the state law, it is required that each child graduating from the home be trained in both these fields. A child entering the twelfth grade spends half a day in the academic department and half a day in the vocational department. The school is certified by the Department of Education. Last year thirty-nine students were graduated from our school. During the last five years, twenty-five percent of the graduates continued their education in colleges and technical schools within Ohio. We operate an athletic program and a junior ROTC program. We provide medical and dental facilities for our children. We have a social service department which is responsible for admissions and discharges. Also, in our home we have what is referred to as community projects for clubs, girl scouts, boy scouts and so forth. We are a complete community within ourselves.

In the problem areas, which we all have, we have a number of problems which I would like to describe now. Thirty-five to forty-five percent of our students are behind in proper grade placement. Of course, we have a problem in the area of adjustment. The children we receive at the home have many physical and health problems. This is taken care of through our facilities. One of the problems that we are constantly working on is an understanding on the part of our employees of a child's deficiencies.

Under Title I we have realized that while we

The Ohio Soldiers and Sailors Orphans Home, located in Greene County, is for the children of veterans of the State of Ohio. Our home is celebrating its centennial this year. It was started in 1869 by the Grand Army of the Republic. It became a state function in December of 1869 and has remained such during these hundred years. We are a state agency. Our Board of Trustees, appointed by the governor for five-year terms, has the responsibility for establishing policies in accordance with the state code for the operation of the home.

We operate a school system, grades one through twelve, having both an academic department and a vocational department. Under the state law, it is required that each child graduating from the home be trained in both these fields. A child entering the twelfth grade spends half a day in the academic department and half a day in the vocational department. The school is certified by the Department of Education. Last year thirty-nine students were graduated from our school. During the last five years, twenty-five percent of the graduates continued their education in colleges and technical schools within Ohio. We operate an athletic program and a junior ROTC program. We provide medical and dental facilities for our children. We have a social service department which is responsible for admissions and discharges. Also, in our home we have what is referred to as community projects for clubs, girl scouts, boy scouts and so forth. We are a complete community within ourselves.

In the problem areas, which we all have, we have a number of problems which I would like to describe now. Thirty-five to forty-five percent of our students are behind in proper grade placement. Of course, we have a problem in the area of adjustment. The children we receive at the home have many physical and health problems. This is taken care of through our facilities. One of the problems that we are constantly working on is an understanding on the part of our employees of a child's deficiencies.

Under Title I we have realized that while we thought we were doing a good job there were many things that could be done that were not being done. Title I has given us an opportunity to provide both an elementary and a secondary reading program. It has provided us an opportunity to improve our math program. As an example, we found in our vocational school that a number of students are not capable of really understanding certain measurements, gauges, and so forth. We had to institute a math program in our vocational school. Through a survey we also found that our children were lacking in certain refinements which a child would receive in a normal home, such as how to prepare and serve a meal. Under the Title I program we were able to institute certain programs of this nature. For the girls we established a home mechanics course.

We have been able to extend our summer school program under Title I. The number of children who are behind in proper grade placement has decreased twenty-five percent and we have also been able to provide enrichment programs for certain children. We have also been able in the education field to provide our children an opportunity to visit and study at historical sites and certain cultural activities in Columbus, Cincinnati, and other areas.

The big thing that we have been able to do in the school area with Title I is individual instruction. All of us in this room realize that the children that we are dealing with greatly need individual instruction. In the adjustment area we have found that we cannot get enough individual and group indoctrination for our children. Through certain agencies in our area we have brought in people who have done a wonderful job in counseling our children and helping them solve some of their problems. To me this is one of the greatest things that has happened in our Title I program.

In the physical problems area we were able to establish a speech and hearing clinic. Many of these problems were unknown to us prior to the Title I program. Under the Title I program and in a contract with an agency in Dayton, Ohio, a professional surveyed all the children.

As a result, at least twenty children were enrolled in group therapy in both speech and hearing during the past year. We recently surveyed all children again in preparing the program for next year. We have also been able to do a better job in the eye clinic.

To further the understanding of a child's proficiency we were able to establish seminars, off the campus and on the campus, for our employees. In one program we sent our house parents and other non-academic employees to the University of North Carolina which has one of the best child care counseling services for group living. In the last two years we have sent approximately ten people to a two-weeks course and some to a month-long course at the university.

In summary, what have been the results of the Title I program at the Ohio Soldiers and Sailors Orphans Home? We have been able to have a better opportunity to serve the children of veterans of the State of Ohio, to widen our program, and to be of greater service in numbers to those children who are so desperately in need of proper training and education.

* * * *

Dr. Roger Gove

Title I programs have been particularly valuable in the Department of Mental Hygiene and Correctional Institutions. Ten institutions are participating in the program. Five of these are in the Department of Mental Retardation and five are in the Division of Mental Hygiene. My experience with these programs goes back to 1966 when I was a superintendent of the Columbus State Institute and I think we have seen great strides made as a result of the services that have been brought to the boys and girls in our institutions for the mentally retarded. Previously existing programs have been extended and expanded in terms of their breadth. We have bee to bring new kinds of activities and dep from the routine kinds of programs that not have been possible without the assista Title I funds. We have had the opportu bring new materials and new techniqu our curriculum. We have been able to instruction to those who were not pre served. Particularly we had an outstandi portunity to develop a language develo program through the use of closed circui vision. I might say in passing that I was very strong advocate of closed circuit tele I had to be sold on this in the very begi but I became convinced after seeing the circuit television in operation. Over the of four years I have become convinced tha is a very effective device in the teachi children and I think without the assistan Title I funds we would not have been a accomplish this.

We have also been able to develop a variety of inservice programs for teacher teacher aides, and this has been partic helpful in the expansion and extension o services to the children in institutions.

The projects that we have seen deve through the use of Title I funds are almo numerous to mention. They include proje home economics, music, physical develop language development, community adjus and socialization, life skills and progra social and vocational training. We have gram in which we bring students to Colu to gain experience in such activities as shopping, attending movies, and riding Doing the kinds of things they would need or would want to do if they were living i community.

Title I funds helped to sponsor shelter w shops and a wilderness camping activity tha been developed in Ross County by the Colu State Institute.

Henry Norman, who is our supervisor i department, has called to my attention tha have had almost one and a half million d

in terms of their breadth. We have been able to bring new kinds of activities and departures from the routine kinds of programs that would not have been possible without the assistance of Title I funds. We have had the opportunity to bring new materials and new techniques into our curriculum. We have been able to expand instruction to those who were not previously served. Particularly we had an outstanding opportunity to develop a language development program through the use of closed circuit television. I might say in passing that I was not a very strong advocate of closed circuit television. I had to be sold on this in the very beginning, but I became convinced after seeing the closed circuit television in operation. Over the period of four years I have become convinced that this is a very effective device in the teaching of children and I think without the assistance of Title I funds we would not have been able to accomplish this.

We have also been able to develop a wide variety of inservice programs for teachers and teacher aides, and this has been particularly helpful in the expansion and extension of our services to the children in institutions.

The projects that we have seen developed through the use of Title I funds are almost too numerous to mention. They include projects in home economics, music, physical development, language development, community adjustment and socialization, life skills and programs in social and vocational training. We have a program in which we bring students to Columbus to gain experience in such activities as going shopping, attending movies, and riding buses. Doing the kinds of things they would need to do or would want to do if they were living in the community.

Title I funds helped to sponsor shelter workshops and a wilderness camping activity that has been developed in Ross County by the Columbus State Institute.

Henry Norman, who is our supervisor in our department, has called to my attention that we have had almost one and a half million dollars over a five-year period out of Title I funds for the programs that are serving about 1,500 students who participate in these various projects. Characteristic of federal funding as I understand it, a great many projects that were started with federal funds have been continued with state funds. I believe this is one of the important values of federal funding, that is, serving as seed money to give us an opportunity to try something new and then take it over as a state financial responsibility. This has happened in a number of situations.

It needs to be emphasized that the responsibility for the development of projects rests primarily with the local agency, the local institution or school board in the case of public education. The responsibility for coming up with ideas, writing up a project and formulating plans to evaluate the project rests squarely on the individuals who are responsible for the care, treatment, and training of the residents in our institutions. The progress in meeting needs depends upon the vision and initiative of the local education authority and the state agency personnel, the superintendent, education director and other members of the staff. I think it is primarily for this reason this meeting was called to get all of you here to hopefully infuse in you a kind of new comprehension of your responsibility and to provide some kind of motivation for you to come up with some new ideas and expand your present programs.

* * * *

Harold J. Bowers

Numerous statutes of the State of Ohio require that the Department of Education cooperate with other state agencies and that those agencies also cooperate with the Department. Even without those statutes I am sure we would have the fine cooperative working relationship

which I have had the pleasure to observe during my 34 years in the Department.

It is gratifying to hear the testimony that we have heard this evening about what Title I funds are doing for the youngsters in your institutions. I am sure you have read much of the criticism that has been aimed at the use of Title I money in the public schools throughout the nation. I don't believe it. Our job is to use that money to make a difference in young people, to help them to meet their needs and encourage them to learn so that we can turn them out into the world or back into society as self-sustaining individuals and as better citizens than they were before. I was thinking while I was listening to some remarks here that if it weren't for the failures of the public schools, some of you would be without jobs. Especially in the institutional programs for delinquents and in others, you have inherited the failures of public schools. We are using Title I money to develop many new programs in the public schools to do a better job and relieve you of the responsibility of correcting our errors.

We have heard a lot about the dropouts and they become your problem too. I recall that during the war years only 40 of every 100 youngsters who entered the first grade finished high school 12 years later. That was of no concern to anyone because the dropouts were employable at that time. Today there has been a significant change. I am sure it is not all due to the fact that dropouts are unemployable now. I think we have improved the holding power of the schools by providing educational programs which students can see as valuable. This year 78 of every 100 youngsters completed high school.

We do have a number of projects underway which we think will do a great deal to help improve the program of public schools. As you know we are embarking upon the most massive program of vocational education that we have ever experienced. A law was enacted which required that all schools provide a vocational educational program which will meet the vocational and occupational needs of all children. We have had that law for four or five years. It was not effective because funds were not available to do the job. Just recently legislation was enacted which required the enlargement of school districts, and $75 million from State Issue Number One money was allocated to vocational education. I think these actions will make a big difference and ought to go far in helping solve our dropout problem. I think the word dropout is a misnomer. I think they are "letouts" or "pushouts." Under the compulsory attendance law in Ohio, youngsters are required to remain in school until they are 18 years old or until they are 18 years old or until they are old enough to get a work permit. However, when we release them for a job, employers fail to notify school authorities if the youngster loses that first job. Consequently they are never brought back into school. Schools make very little effort to bring such youngsters back because I think they were glad to be rid of them in the first place.

I was thinking of an experience I had with a potential dropout some 40 years ago as a small town superintendent. He was marking time until he could leave school because he saw no value to it. One day he gave the English teacher a good cussing in class and she brought him down to the office for disciplining. During the interview he proceeded to get a little rough and threaten me. So, I had to give him what the Appalachians refer to as a good "whopping." On the way home from school that evening he told a bunch of youngsters that someday he would be big enough to lick that so and so. After a few years went by, he dropped out of school, developed into a six-footer weighing about 240 pounds, and worked part-time with the village blacksmith. One evening I answered a knock at the door and he said would you step out on the front porch a minute. That incident flashed back and I thought my time had come. Sure enough, he said you remember when you beat me up at school a couple of years ago, and I said yes. He said that was the reason he was there. He added that he had joined the new church across the street and was the Sunday School superintendent. I said I was glad to hear that. He said, "Since I got religion I have nothing but the love of God in my heart for my

ve during

y that we
le I funds
stitutions.
criticism
I money
nation. I
money to
help them
n to learn
world or
ndividuals
e before.
to some
e failures
would be
ional pro-
you have
. We are
new pro-
better job
correcting

pouts and
ecall that
very 100
e finished
as of no
outs were
has been
ot all due
able now.
power of
programs
This year
gh school.

underway
l to help
s. As you
st massive
we have
ed which
vocational
the voca-
children.
ive years.

It was not effective because funds were not available to do the job. Just recently legislation was enacted which required the enlargement of school districts, and $75 million from State Issue Number One money was allocated to vocational education. I think these actions will make a big difference and ought to go far in helping solve our dropout problem. I think the word dropout is a misnomer. I think they are "letouts" or "pushouts." Under the compulsory attendance law in Ohio, youngsters are required to remain in school until they are 18 years old or until they are 18 years old or until they are old enough to get a work permit. However, when we release them for a job, employers fail to notify school authorities if the youngster loses that first job. Consequently they are never brought back into school. Schools make very little effort to bring such youngsters back because I think they were glad to be rid of them in the first place.

I was thinking of an experience I had with a potential dropout some 40 years ago as a small town superintendent. He was marking time until he could leave school because he saw no value to it. One day he gave the English teacher a good cussing in class and she brought him down to the office for disciplining. During the interview he proceeded to get a little rough and threaten me. So, I had to give him what the Appalachians refer to as a good "whopping." On the way home from school that evening he told a bunch of youngsters that someday he would be big enough to lick that so and so. After a few years went by, he dropped out of school, developed into a six-footer weighing about 240 pounds, and worked part-time with the village blacksmith. One evening I answered a knock at the door and he said would you step out on the front porch a minute. That incident flashed back and I thought my time had come. Sure enough, he said you remember when you beat me up at school a couple of years ago, and I said yes. He said that was the reason he was there. He added that he had joined the new church across the street and was the Sunday School superintendent. I said I was glad to hear that. He said, "Since I got religion I have nothing but the love of God in my heart for my fellow man and I just came to beg your forgiveness for holding immity against you for so long." Obviously I was quite thankful that he had gotten religion.

Some of the new projects or new programs that we are developing in the Department of Education are in family living or sex education. You may remember we made some reference to sex education in the elementary school standards and about 200 people swarmed into the State Board meeting to protest. It reminded me of a remark that Jack Benny made. Asked what he thought about sex education in the schools Benny said, "Well, haven't we always had it?" No, it's relatively new. Well, we had it in school when I was a boy but we called it recess.

The other new programs are Consumer Economics, the Right To Read Program, which you have heard a lot about, Environmental Studies, and we are just developing a new program in Drug Education. When I came to the Department in 1936 in charge of teacher education and certification most of my time was taken up interviewing people. Attorneys, engineers, you name it, they were begging for employment in teaching. Remember in 1936 we were at the tag end of a depression. There was little else to do and everyone wanted to teach school. In a couple years the nation began tooling up for World War II and the industrial activity from then on down to the present time has caused an acute teacher shortage. Up until this year. This year for the first time since 1936, people are coming to the department begging for opportunities to teach. Which means that not only have we increased the supply of teachers but also the recession is having its effect and many who left the classrooms are seeking to come back. This ought to help improve education too.

Incidentally, that completes the cycle through which education passes, from an over supply to shortage and back to an over supply. So, since the merry-go-round has completed its cycle, I am going to get off where I got on and retire in September. As I look over the program and as many of you have remarked, it is a very challenging one. You have recruited a very outstanding staff to assist you in this program.

* * * *

Daniel W. Johnson

When I became director of the Ohio Youth Commission five years ago our staff set about to enrich its staff and its program. Our greatest acceleration was made in our educational program. Five years ago we had five accredited schools in our system; we now have nine. There are over 240 certified teachers in our junior and senior high school curriculum.

From 1965 to 1967 we operated a basic educational program. We found that there was something lacking in this program. By June 30 of this year we will have received in the excess of 3,500 delinquent boys and girls. In our testing process at our Juvenile Diagnostic Center we find that the majority of these children are underachievers or educationally handicapped in that they do not meet their age or their grade level at the time we receive them. Some are as much as two years behind their age group. Education as usual did not reach the majority of these children and we were so grateful when in 1967 we had the opportunity to participate in a federal grant which gave us the enrichment that we so desperately needed. In the summer of 1967, 450 children of the Youth Commission gained skills through nine centers of community skills improvement. And this program has grown. In the school year September 1969-1970, 1,400 of our children will be beneficiaries of this program. Our evaluation clearly indicates a most encouraging sign. The growth of these children is really amazing.

Approximately a year ago State Senators Ralph Regula and Oliver Ocasek, known for their abiding interest in education, visited our high school at the Fairfield School for Boys and for the first time became aware of this program. I was contacted by Senator Regula and was instructed in fact that we should let this program be known to the public. We immediately prepared some news releases and pamphlets to let the public know what was being done.

We have been able to add to our system, by reason of this program, a school psychologist, counselors, specialized teachers and a pair of professional educational aides. Without this federal assistance our budget would not permit the addition of this type of staff. We are so grateful for the increasing assistance we are now receiving.

We are also adding some new techniques and ideas by reason of this program. Only a few months ago at our high school at Fairfield School for Boys a program called Nature Study was added. If you have visited that school, you have seen its beautiful setting in the Hocking Hills. In the center of the campus is a beautiful valley. Our science coordinator at the school had the germ of the idea for a nature trail where a study is made not only of science but of nature itself and the animal life in that valley. Our boys are asking to get into that program and we think that the impact will be tremendous.

This summer we expect to have an intensive inservice and staff development program to develop new specialized curriculum. We are introducing video tape and closed circuit television. In Cleveland, where so many of our boys and girls come from, we have started a pilot program in which a counselor is employed to ease the transition for children returning to the public schools. In time we hope to have counselors of this type participating in each of the major cities so that most of these children will have a better opportunity of completing their public school education.